

STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA

main,sts

205Ev13

Lutheran quarterly.

v.47 1917 Lutheran quarterly



0 0001 00658549 9

# REFERENCE



# COLLECTIONS





04-79-875-7







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries





THE  
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLVII

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1917

**U. S.** *Federal trade commission.*

... Report on trade and tariffs in Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Peru. June 30, 1916. Washington, Govt. print. off., 1916.

246 p. incl. tables, forms. 25<sup>cm</sup>.

At head of title: Federal trade commission.

1. U. S.—Comm.—Spanish America. 2. Spanish America—Comm.—  
U. S. 3. Tariff—Spanish America. I. Title.

Library of Congress

— — — — — Copy 2.

HF3080.A4 1916

[s19h3]

16—26739



# CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLVII

- America, The Message of the Lutheran Church to, 535.
- Anticipations of Christian Theology in the Writings of Heathen and Jewish Philosophers, 554.
- Augsburg Confession, Article IX, 307.
- Baptism, Article IX of the Augsburg Confession, 307.
- Caesar and His Soldiers, 71.
- Christian Doctrine, Is There Need of a Restatement of, 515.
- Clutz, Prof. J. A., Articles by, 1, 340.
- Evolution as Appropriated by Socialism, The Theory of, 85.
- Faulkner, Prof. John Alfred, Articles by, 52, 471.
- Feldman, Rev. W. H., Article by, 99.
- Fox, Dr. Luther A., Article by, 161.
- General Synod at Chicago, 413.
- General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, Liturgical Development of the, 491.
- Germany, The Economic Forces of, 260, 386.
- Getty, Rev. G. Albert, Article by, 232.
- Ghodes, Prof. C. B., Articles by, 241, 375.
- Hantz, Prof. J. M., Article by, 554.
- Hebrews, "A Recent History of the," 204.
- Heffner, Prof. Wm. Clinton, Articles by, 260, 386.
- Infallibility of the Pope, The, 161.
- Inner Mission—Its Goal, 99.
- Jacoby, Rev. J. C., Article by, 276.
- Keyser, Dr. Leander S., Articles by, 204, 515.
- Lord's Supper, Melancthon and the, 52.
- Lewars, Elsie Singmaster, Article by, 224.
- Literature, Review of Recent, 138, 301, 443, 583.
- Liturgical Development of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, 491.
- Luther and the Reformers Before the Reformation, 457.
- Luther's Attitude Toward Scripture, 355.
- Luther in the Changing Light of Four Centuries, Martin, 20.
- Luther, Melancthon and the Lord's Supper After His Divergence from, 52.
- Luther, the Preacher, 404.
- Lutheran Church to America, The Message of the, 535.
- Lutheran Church in America, The Norwegian, 422.
- Lutheran Missions, Early, 224.
- Lutheran Truth to the Coming Generation, How Can We Transmit, 375.
- Lutheranism, The Marks of, 340.
- Marks of Lutheranism, 340.
- Message of the Lutheran Church to America, 535.
- Melancthon and the Lord's Supper After His Divergence from Luther, 52.
- Ministers as Preachers of the Word, 276.
- Missions, Early Lutheran, 224.
- Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, The, 422.
- Philosophers, Anticipations of Christian Theology in Writings of Heathen and Jewish, 554.
- Pope, The Infallibility of the, 161.

- Preaching from the Pericope, 232.  
 Preachers of the Word, Ministers as, 276.  
 Preacher, Luther as a, 404.  
 Puritan and Palatine, 241.  
 Quadricentennial, The Reformation, 1.  
 Reformation Quadricentennial, The, 1.  
 Reformation, Luther and the Reformers Before the, 457.  
 Reformation, Was There Need of the, 471.  
 Restatement of Christian Doctrine, Is There Need of a, 515.  
 Review of Recent Literature, 138, 301, 443, 583.  
 Scripture, Luther's Attitude Toward, 35.  
 Singmaster, Prof. J. A., Current Theological Thought, in English, 120, 287, 428, 566.  
 Singmaster, Dr. J. A., Articles by, 404, 413, 422, 457.  
 Smith, Dr. R. Morris, Article by, 491.  
 Socialism, The Theory of Evolution as Appropriated by, 85.  
 Soldiers, Caesar and His, 71.  
 Stork, T. B., Article by, 71.  
 Synod at Chicago, The General, 413.  
 Theology, Anticipation of Christian, in the Writings of Heathen and Jewish Philosophers, 554.  
 Theological Thought, Current, in English, by Prof. J. A. Singmaster, 120, 287, 428, 566.  
 Theological Thought, Current, in German, by Prof. Abdel Ross Wentz, 130.  
 Traver, Rev. A. J., Article by, 85.  
 Tressler, Prof. V. G. A., Article by, 355.  
 Wagner, Dr. John, Article by, 307.  
 War, The Problem of, 187.  
 Wentz, Prof. Abdel Ross, Articles by, 20, 535.  
 Wynn, Prof. W. H., Article by, 187.



## BOOKS REVIEWED.

### JANUARY.

The Formula of Concord—Luther's Christmas Tree—The Challenge of the Sunday School—Life of Adolph Spaeth, D.D., LL.D.—Bible Stories to Read and Tell—The Challenge of the Future—The Mythology of All Races—R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D.—The Man of Power—Modern Messages from Great Hymns—The Undiscovered Country—Foundations of Christian Belief—The Gospel of Good Will as Revealed in Contemporary Scriptures—The Essentials of Religious Education—The Enchanted Universe—The Lord God of Elijah—Usury—Little Journeys with Martin Luther—The Books of the Pentateuch—Year Books—The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1917—Almanac for the Year 1917—Der Zionsbote Christlicher Volkskalendar auf das Jahr 1917—Luther in the Light of Recent Research.

### APRIL.

The Mythology of All Races, Indian and Iranian—Introduction to Lutheran Symbolics—Lincoln's Gettysburg Address—When Christ Comes Again—The Enlarging Conception of God—Paul's Doctrine of Redemption—The German Element in York Co., Pa.—Apologetics or a System of Christian Evidence—Gardening and Out of Doors—Church Management.

### JULY.

Religious Experience; Its Evidential Value—Good Ministers of Jesus Christ—John and His Writings—The Story of Lutheran Missions—The Best Man I Know—An Introduction to the Old Testament—Doctor Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther—Luther's Battle Song—List of References on the History of the Reformation—Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der ev.-Luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten—The Professor of Wittenberg—To What Extent May Christians Advisedly Dance—The Word of a Woman versus the Word of God.

### OCTOBER.

Religious Education and Democracy—Missionary Education in Home and School—The Other Side of the Hill and Home Again—With the Children—Scotty Kid—Christian Nurture—James Monroe Buckley—The Cyclopedia of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals—A Prophet of the Spirit—Bring Him to Me—Religion in a World at War—Saint Paul the Hero—The Singing Weaver and Other Stories—A Booklet of Teaching Drills for Sun-

day School and Home—The Gracious Water of Life—A Cradle Roll Manual for Sunday Schools—He Whom Thou Lovest is Sick—A History of the Reformation—The New Archeological Discoveries—What the World Owes Luther—Protest and Progress in the XVIth Century—The Spirit of American Lutheranism—Liturgy and Agenda—Second Volume of Dr. Walther's Letters—Story of My Life and Work—Thirty-five Years of Luther Research—The Pope's Catechism.

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1917.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE REFORMATION QUADRI-CENTENNIAL.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. CLUTZ, D.D.

Much is being said and written just now about the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, which occurs during this year, 1917. Under normal conditions this anniversary would no doubt have attracted much more attention, and would have been carried out on a much grander scale, in Europe, and especially in Germany, than in this country. The Reformation was essentially a European movement. America had been discovered only fifteen years when Luther issued his world-awakening and now world-renowned challenge to the Church of Rome by nailing his Ninety-five Theses to the church door in Wittenberg, on October 31, 1517. All the great events that followed were staged in European countries and cities and towns. All the places and shrines made memorable and sacred in connection with either the heroes of the Reformation or their heroic deeds are to be found there. There live also the great mass of that mighty host who to-day are called by the name of the great Reformer, and who profess and hold the truth which he and his co-laborers gave to the world four hundred years ago.

But, alas, all Europe is torn and convulsed by the great



world-war now raging, and of the early termination of which there is so little hope at the time of writing this. Even if the war should end during the year, which may God grant, the nations that have been engaged in the titanic struggle will have other things to do and to think of than the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. They will have the terms of peace to arrange, and their desolated homes to rebuild, and their ruined industries to reconstruct or adjust to the new conditions, and practically a new civilization to develop. If the war continues, which may God forbid, then all that can be expected is more terror, and frightfulness, and bloodshed, and destruction, and tears, a growing horror of great darkness.

Hence the probabilities are that the chief celebration of this great anniversary will take place in this country. It is with this, therefore, that we are especially concerned. It will no doubt be participated in to a greater or less extent by all Protestant denominations, for all have an interest in it either as the time of their birth, or as making that birth possible at a later date. Many social and civil organizations may also take note of the event and pay tribute to the man and the movement of four centuries ago, since they are all indebted to Martin Luther and to the Reformation of which he was the chief leader for many of the greatest and most precious privileges and blessings in which they rejoice today. In fact, the whole modern world with all our boasted modern civilization, is the product of that wonderful movement which swept over Europe in the sixteenth century.

In its extent, in the interests involved, and in the results that flowed from it and that are still going on with an ever enlarging sweep of influence and blessing, the Reformation was without doubt one of the greatest movements in all history since the beginning of the Christian era. Indeed, in the judgment of many, the coming of Jesus Christ into the world and the founding of the Christian Church is the only event in all history which actually transcends the Reformation in importance and in its far-reaching results. We commonly speak of it as the



Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, but it really began long before that. If we are to find the roots of it we must go back to the teaching and preaching of Wickliff, and Huss, and Savonarola in the fifteenth century, and even farther still to the work of Meister Eckhart, the "Father of German Mysticism" in the close of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries. The work of Luther and his co-laborers in the sixteenth century was only the culmination of a movement which already had been under way and gathering force and momentum for at least two hundred years. If it had not been so Luther would probably have shared the fate of many who had preceded him, and would have ended his career in prison, or in exile, or at the stake.

We are wont to speak of the Reformation as the German Reformation. But it was not confined to Germany. It had its inception there, and for a century or more Germany remained the chief storm center. But it quickly extended southward into Switzerland, and northward into the Scandinavian countries, and westward into England and Scotland. It was thus not merely a national but a truly continental movement.

We are proud to speak of it as the Lutheran Reformation. This may be justified by the fact that Luther was the most conspicuous figure in it, and that to him and his co-workers in Germany its success was most largely due. But we must not forget those who wrought with him in other lands, as Calvin in Geneva, and Zwingli in Zurich, and John Knox in Scotland, and Cranmer and John Colet in England. Neither should we forget that out of this general movement there came eventually the various branches of the Reformed or non-Lutheran Churches which now embrace nearly half of Protestantism, and in some respects the more aggressive and influential half.

We naturally think and speak of the Reformation chiefly as a religious movement, for such it was pre-eminently. Yet it was also much more than this. It really affected every interest and activity of man, not only in that age, but in all subsequent ages down to the present time, literary, educational, social, economic, political, in-



dustrial and commercial. It was like the rising of the tides in the sea which stir to its depths the whole mass of the waters and send the great swelling waves in towards the shore until they fill every gulf, and bay, and river, and inlet along the entire coast-line. So the Reformation stirred the whole mass of the peoples throughout all Europe, from the Pope in the Vatican and the Emperor on his throne and the princes in their palaces, to the humblest peasants in their lowly places and vocations. It eventually raised the general level of human life socially, intellectually, morally and spiritually, throughout the whole civilized world. Neither has the upward impulse then given ever been lost. There have, of course, been times of retrogression and decadence, as in the rising of the tides there are reflux waves when the water seems to be receding, but the general course of development has been ever onward and upward.

It is entirely fitting, therefore, that the whole Protestant world at least should celebrate in a becoming way the quadricentennial of the Reformation, and thus give expression to their appreciation of all the benefits and blessings which are the fruits of the Reformation and the accumulation of the intervening centuries. Even the Roman Catholic Church would have ample grounds for celebrating this anniversary with gratitude and praise because of the Counter-Reformation which the Lutheran Reformation made possible and even necessary in the Catholic Church, and which has made it a different institution today from what it was at the time of the Reformation especially in those lands in which it comes into close contact with the Protestant Churches.

But naturally the Lutheran Church has a larger interest in this anniversary than the general public, and a larger interest than any other ecclesiastical body. As Lutherans we can hardly make too much of it. It would argue a most deplorable lack of appreciation of the work of Luther and his co-laborers of the sixteenth century, and prove us wholly unworthy of our glorious heritage, if we did not do all that we can as a Church to refresh our own knowledge of the Reformation and to quicken our

gratitude for what it accomplished, and also to call the attention of others to those great events and to their meaning for the whole world.

But if this quadricentennial celebration is to be really profitable to us as individuals and as a Church, if it is to be made really worth while, so that at the close of the year 1917 we shall find ourselves farther on than at the beginning, we must try to gain some clear conception of the purposes and spirit which are to dominate us in all our meetings, and in all our speaking and writing throughout the year.

Just what these purposes and this spirit should be, it may not be so easy to determine. No two of us would be likely to agree entirely. Much will depend on the standpoint from which we approach the subject and the special interests which appeal to us most strongly. There will, however, be some broad and general lines on which it would seem that all ought to be able to work in harmony.

1. Certainly, all will agree that one object of the celebration should be the giving of *information*. Our own people need this information. The great majority of them, it is to be feared, are woefully ignorant concerning the most primary historical facts connected with the Reformation. Still fewer of them, we suspect, know anything about the principles involved in that great movement, or the real results obtained.

The writer had occasion, some months ago, to make a test of this in a company of thirty-two people who, from their associations and training and general advantages, might have been expected to know far more about these things than the average membership of our churches. Only twelve of the thirty-two knew both the place and the date of Luther's birth. Only two could give the names of both the father and the mother of Luther. Only nineteen could tell why Luther became a monk, and nearly all of these laid the emphasis on the external and immediate occasion of his taking this step, the storm and the fright and his consequent vow to St. Anne, rather than upon his desire to find rest for a troubled conscience burdened with a sense of sin. Only seven could give the



name of the order of monks which he joined. Only ten were able to name three of Luther's chief literary contributions to the progress of the Reformation, and only seven of these mentioned the translation of the Bible into the German vernacular as one of these. Only ten had ever read the entire Augsburg Confession, and only fourteen could tell why it is called the Augsburg Confession. Not one of the number could give the names of three of Luther's chief co-workers in Germany, though twenty-eight named Melancthon as one of them. Only six could give the year of Luther's death, and five of the number did not know what was the special abuse of the Church of Rome against which Luther aimed his Ninety-five Theses.

If any of our readers are disposed to think that these thirty-two people were especially stupid or ill-informed, we would suggest that they make a similar test, without previous warning, of any chance company of Lutheran laymen that they may find available for the purpose, say an adult Bible class, or a Young People's Society, or the persons present at a mid-week prayer service. Hand to them a series of questions like the following, and see how many of them can answer them correctly:

1. Name two "Reformers before the Reformation" who preceded Luther by about a century.
2. Give the place and date of Luther's birth.
3. What were the names of his father and mother?
4. Why did Luther become a monk?
5. To what order of monks did he belong?
6. Why is October 31 known in the calendar of the Church Year as "Reformation Day?"
7. Against what special abuse of the Church of Rome were Luther's Ninety-five Theses directed?
8. What was Luther's chief literary contribution to the Reformation?
9. When and why did Luther prepare his Larger and Smaller Catechisms?
10. Which is the most popular of all of Luther's hymns?



11. What was Luther's reply when he was asked to recant at the Diet of Worms?

12. Why was Luther concealed in the Wartburg castle for a season?

13. Why is the Augsburg Confession so called?

14. How many articles does it have, and how are they divided?

15. Have you ever read all the articles of the Augsburg Confession?

16. What is meant by "the formal principle," and what by "the material principle" of the Reformation?

17. What great doctrine did Luther call "the doctrine of a standing or a falling Church?"

18. Name three of Luther's principal co-workers in Germany.

19. What German prince was Luther's chief friend and protector?

20. Name three of Luther's contemporaries who were leaders of the Reformation in other countries.

21. What was the chief point of difference between Luther and Zwingli at the Marburg Conference?

22. In what year did Luther die?

23. Mention some of the results of the Reformation which we still enjoy.

24. What is the relative strength of the Lutheran Church among Protestants throughout the world?

25. What is the relative strength of the Lutheran Church among Protestants in the United States?

It may be said that the knowledge of these facts is not essential to salvation. This is of course true, but it is important. It is essential to efficiency in church work. How can our people be expected to have any warm love for their Church, or to show any intelligent devotion to it, or any great activity in its work, if they are ignorant of such primary facts concerning its history? These and such as these are just the facts that will be repeated over and over again in the addresses made, and in the articles written, and in the books published during this quadri-centennial year, and we shall be greatly surprised and disappointed if at its close our people generally are not



very much better informed as to them than they were at the beginning.

Of the mistaken conceptions or crass ignorance of the Lutheran Church and its history and teachings among the other denominations there is no need to write at length. There are very few Lutherans, certainly very few Lutheran ministers, who have not been confronted and made indignant by it again and again. Sometimes it may be our own fault. As a Church we have often been too modest and deferential, sometimes too apologetic. Sometimes we have been too exclusive and selfish and self-complacent. No wonder we have remained unknown or have been misunderstood. Sometimes this ignorance of our Church among non-Lutherans is the result of circumstances over which neither they nor we have had any control.

But whatever may have been the cause of such ignorance or misunderstanding in the past, there will surely be less of it, or at least less excuse for it, in the future. If the plans projected are carried out there will be so much information given to the public during this year by means of public meetings, and addresses, and pageants, and books published, and articles in the religious and secular papers, that there will no longer be any excuse for any even fairly intelligent man or woman of this generation ever to say to us again: "Methodists we know, and Baptists we know, and Presbyterians we know, but who are ye?"

2. *Conservation* is another result to be aimed at and expected from the quadricentennial celebration of the Reformation. The rehearsal of the history of the Reformation, and the bringing out into clearer light of the principles and doctrines that were the chief dynamics in the movement, and the setting in order of the mighty results that flowed from it, can hardly help giving us as Lutherans a fuller and richer appreciation of the great cost and the priceless value of our Lutheran heritage and kindling within us a new determination to preserve it undiminished and uncorrupted for ourselves and for future generations.



We would be glad to believe that this would be no difficult task in this the twentieth century of the Christian era, and after four hundred years of Protestantism. But we know better. We cannot thus deceive ourselves in face of the facts with which we are all too familiar. It is only too evident that some of the strongest denominations of Protestantism are being honey-combed with the new rationalism of the day that parades under the form either of a destructive "Higher Criticism," or of a so-called "New Theology." The two generally go together each supporting and reinforcing the other. The one strikes at the integrity of the Scriptures, and the other at the integrity of the faith. The success of either must prove fatal to some of the most important and most cherished truths and principles of the Reformation.

One of these is the doctrine that the Bible is the inspired word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice. This is usually spoken of as "the formal principle" of the Reformation, though the term has been objected to by some. It voiced the protest of Luther and his co-workers against the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church that tradition was co-ordinate with the Holy Scriptures, and that the Church as represented by the Pope and the Councils was even superior to them. It was to this principle that Luther appealed at the Diet of Worms when he declared that he would not recant any of his writings unless they were proved false out of the Holy Scriptures, because it was evident that the Pope and the Councils had often erred, ending with the famous words: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise: God help me. Amen."

Upon this principle the Lutheran Church has always stood and still stands, by the side of its great leader. But this is just one of the truths that is being most bitterly assailed at the present day. True, the attack comes from an entirely different source, and is of quite a different character. It is not the Roman Catholic Church which we have to fear today, but a pretentious and destructive critical scholarship within the ranks of Protestantism itself. It is not tradition, or Pope, or Council



that this new enemy would make co-ordinate with the Word of God, or even superior to it, but human reason and experience. These, we are told, are to be accepted as authoritative not only for the interpretation of the word of God, but also for the determination of what is the word of God. According to this teaching the Bible is not to be regarded as the word of God, but only as containing the word of God. And if we are to be guided by what is so boastfully called "the accepted results of modern scholarship," we must believe that it contains very little that is really and truly the word of God. Instead of being a divinely inspired revelation it is little more than a human compilation or invention. Instead of being an "infallible rule of faith and practice," as the Reformers taught, and as the Lutheran Church has always believed, it is an exceedingly fallible book, full of myths and fables and folk-lore that must be taken with many grains of salt or entirely discredited.

The other pillar of truth upon which the Reformers builded is the doctrine of justification by faith alone, without any admixture of human powers, or merits, or works. This has been called "the material principle" of the Reformation, though not without protest from some as in the case of "the formal principle." But in neither case has there ever been any protest against the truth involved, or against the place given to that truth in the Reformation, but only against the use of the terms "formal" and "material." The Reformers really leaned more heavily on this doctrine of justification by faith alone than on the other doctrine of the supremacy and infallibility of the Scriptures. Luther pronounced it "the doctrine of a standing or a falling Church." It is given confessional statement in Article IV of the Augsburg Confession. In the Smalcald Articles it is declared that "Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth and all things should sink to ruin."

This doctrine is being assailed today also, indirectly if not directly, by the denial of the doctrines of original sin and total depravity, and by the denial of the true deity

of Jesus Christ. Man is naturally good, we are told, and all that is necessary for his salvation is better teaching, an improved environment and a resolute will. Men are to be saved by character rather than by grace. If the old term, justification by faith, is used, it is with a new meaning. It is not faith in the atoning death of Christ that brings justification and peace, but faith in the love, and mercy, and all-abounding goodness of God as the Father of all men.

The deity of Jesus Christ is another doctrine that is imperiled at the present time. It is true that the Reformers had no special controversy with the Roman Catholic theologians over this point. The latter made no objection to Article III of the Augsburg Confession in which the Reformers set forth their faith that "the Word, that is, the Son of God, took unto him man's nature, in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, the divine and the human, inseparably joined together in unity of person; one Christ, true God and true man: who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, that he might reconcile the Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men," etc.

But the deity of Christ assumed a new significance and a new importance in Lutheran theology because of its relation to the doctrine of justification by faith. It became fundamental for all Lutheran faith and teaching. It is often said that Lutheran theology is Christo-centric. It all revolves about the person and work of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word. If Christ had not been "true God and true man" as taught in Article III of the Augsburg Confession, He could never have "satisfied for our sins" as taught in Article IV.

Now, however, we are being told that we must not think of Christ as "God and man" but as "God in man." This may not seem at first to make very much difference. But it does make a tremendous difference. It makes all the difference between a divine and a human Savior. These new teachers may and do still speak of Christ as



divine, but when they are pressed for an explanation of His divinity it is found that they mean nothing more than that God was immanent in Christ just as He is immanent in all men, and in all things for that matter. If Christ was more divine than other men, as they grant that He was, it is only because for some reason God was able to manifest Himself in Him more fully than in other men. The difference was wholly one of degree, not of kind, so that after all we have in Christ only a human Savior and not a divine Savior at all such as we find in the teaching of Luther and of all Lutheran theology. The Virgin birth is denied by these new teachers. The miracles are explained away or interpreted allegorically. The bodily resurrection of Jesus is called in question, and of course His bodily ascension and His eternal session at God's right hand. In fact the whole structure of the older Christology is undermined and must eventually fall to the ground, if this new teaching be true.

We cannot go on to refer to other fundamental doctrines that are being assailed today by the New Theology, or by a destructive Historical Criticism. Neither is it necessary. We have said enough to illustrate the danger that threatens us. The point we are trying to emphasize is this, that in the celebration of this four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation we ought to aim at, and expect, such a fresh and full statement of the truths and principles of our Lutheran faith as will give to all our people a clear understanding of them and of their importance, a firm grasp of their truth and reality, and beget in them a determined purpose to hold and defend them against all the assaults of the enemy. This is what we mean by conservation as one of the results of the Quadricentennial Celebration.

We have been wont to congratulate ourselves as Lutherans that our Church, at least in this country, has been affected very little as yet by these modern errors. This is probably true, and it certainly is something for which we should be profoundly grateful. But we can hardly expect to escape the contagion much longer except by fortifying our people against it. These false doctrines



are being preached in many of the pulpits of the denominations. They are being taught in many of the schools both academic and theological, and not a few of our young people are attending these non-Lutheran schools. They permeate much of the literature of the day, books and periodicals. They are most insidiously set forth in a good deal of our modern popular fiction. The only way to save our people from being led astray by them is by making them so familiar with the true doctrines and with the arguments supporting them, that they will be proof against error and falsehood. No finer opportunity for this could be desired than is furnished by this Quadricentennial Celebration.

3. A third thing to be sought and expected from our Quadricentennial Celebration is *inspiration*. This turns our faces towards the future. Hitherto, in our discussion, we have been looking back, now we are to look forward. We have been speaking largely of what has been now we are to think of what is to come. It would be a great mistake to confine our attention to the past, or even to the present. History should never be treated as a Morris chair in which we may lounge and take our ease. It should never be turned into a downy couch on which we may lie and lull ourselves to slumber by the monotonous recitation of the great deeds and the great achievements of our fathers of the sixteenth century. Rather should it become a stimulus to rouse us to action and to stir us to new endeavor. We need not, like Paul, "forget those things which are behind," but we should, like him, ever be "stretching forward to the things which are before." Even Paul did not forget the great history of his people, or lose sight of his obligation to the generations which had preceded him. But he realized that he could not rest in these and be content, that he had his own work to do, his own responsibilities to meet, his own mission to fulfill. It is the same with us as a Church.

Our Quadricentennial Celebration should inspire us, first, with a true and high denominational pride and loyalty. There is a pride that is evil and debasing, whether found in an individual or in a Church. It is cold and

hard and selfish. It holds itself aloof from all who do not belong to its particular class, and looks down on them with disdain and contempt. It was of this kind of pride that the wise man wrote: "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." We do not want any of this in our churches. So there is a loyalty that is only another and politer name for prejudice and bigotry. It is rigid and uncompromising even in things in themselves indifferent, and will show no tolerance and listen to no argument for any departure from itself even in the slightest particular. This is likewise a very unlovely and unchristian thing and should be neither cultivated nor tolerated in our churches.

But there is a pride that is noble and ennobling. It grows out of a deep and pervading gratitude and joy, and produces a sense of pious exaltation, because of the manifestations of God's favor and goodness. There is also a loyalty that can see and recognize all the good in others and bid them God-speed in their work, and yet have such a high appreciation of our own great history and heritage as Lutherans, that it prompts us always to cherish our historical Lutheran faith, and follow our historical forms of worship and methods of work, as the truest and best for us whatever may be the case with others. This is not only the way of true loyalty but it is also the way of largest growth and richest service. In nature, every plant and tree and animal functions best and attains its highest development only by remaining true to its type. In minor things it may change in order to adapt itself to its environment, but it must retain all the essential characteristics of its family or species. If it does not it will grow weak and sickly, will fail to produce "after its kind," and will eventually perish from the earth. So a great historic Church like ours can function best, and most surely reach its highest development and fulfill its God-given mission in the world, by remaining true to its type and thus preserving its identity from generation to generation. In minor things there may be variation and adaptation, but in all essential characteristics, in all those things which really differentiate it from the other Pro-



testant Churches and give to it an individuality of its own, it must be true to its historic origin and development, or lose its identity and forfeit its right to exist as a separate organization. Sometimes our people, and even some of our Lutheran ministers, forget this, and seem to think that our Church will grow more rapidly and attain to a larger usefulness by surrendering all its distinctive doctrines and forms of worship and methods of work, and becoming as much like its neighbors as possible. This may sometimes have brought a temporary and superficial show of advantage, but in the end it has always proved itself a mistake, and has failed. In all the denominations the churches that have had the most substantial growth, and the most solid prosperity, and have done the most for the glory of God and for the saving of the world, are those that have been most loyal to their type. No Church can have more incentives to such loyalty in its history than ours. It will certainly be one of the results of our Quadricentennial Celebration to make this fact clear and to give it all due emphasis.

If nothing more were to be accomplished by the celebration, this alone would make it worth while. A genuine and warm church loyalty would include everything else that is important, or make sure that it would follow in due time. But the committees having the program in charge are wisely emphasizing some other things which are to be kept in mind as worthy aims in this quadricentennial year.

One of these is the circulation of Lutheran literature for the instruction of our own people and for the information of all who can be induced to read it. Many new books will be written and published dealing with all phases of our history, and doctrines, and practical work. An extended series of most interesting and instructive articles are being prepared for our church papers, and these will be published in the papers of other denominations, and even in the secular papers, as far as possible. Special stress is to be laid in this connection on the more general circulation of the various church papers in the homes of our people. The editors of these periodicals

have adopted the slogan: "A Lutheran Church paper in every Lutheran Home by the close of 1917." They may not accomplish this, but any fair approximation to its realization will be of untold benefit to the Church. There is no more efficient pastoral assistant, or stimulant to increased interest and activity in all the work of the Church than the weekly visits of a good, loyal church paper to the homes of our people.

Another thing to be aimed at is the better endowment and equipment of our church schools, especially our colleges and theological seminaries. As Lutherans we have been accustomed to speak with pride of the fact that our Church was "born in a university." But we have hardly proved ourselves worthy of this noble origin in this country where we do not have a single university that was founded by Lutheran money, or that is conducted under Lutheran auspices. True, our Year Book reports two institutions that bear the name of university. But, however excellent schools they may be within their proper province, neither one of them has an endowment, or an equipment, or an organization to justify the title. We have many most excellent colleges and seminaries, but every one of them is more or less handicapped in its work, and especially in competition with the institutions of other Churches, and the undenominational and secular schools, by its limited endowment and equipment. We need to blush when we say it but not a single Lutheran college or seminary in the United States is able to report as much as half a million dollars of endowment. Only four even nearly approach that amount. One institution has a little more than half a million, but this covers both the collegiate and the theological departments.

This ought not so to be. There may have been good and sufficient reasons for the poverty of our schools in the past. For many years the Lutheran Church was a poor and struggling one as compared with a number of our sister Churches. But this is no longer the case. We may not be counted a rich Church even now. We have very few multi-millionaires. We have no Rockefellers, or Carnegies, or Morgans, or Leland Stanfords, or men



of that class. This may be no discredit to us. But we do have the ability to care for our schools much better than we have done. As a people we have shared in the general prosperity of the last half century since the Civil War. We have scores and hundreds of men and women who are able to give and to give largely, and who ought to do so. If they cannot give millions they can give thousands, and tens and hundreds of thousands. We trust that they will be stimulated to this during this Quadricentennial Celebration. We can never adequately endow or equip our schools so long as their presidents or agents must spend their time and strength, and wear out their lives, going about the Church collecting small amounts from the rank and file of our people, sometimes even from the Sunday Schools, and Women's Societies, and other benevolent organizations of the Church. We would not despise these small contributions. In fact, we highly value them because we want all our people to be interested in our institutions and to have a share in the joy and blessing of maintaining them. But for adequate endowment and equipment, if we are ever to have this, we must depend on the large gifts of a relatively few whom God has exceptionally blessed and prospered, and to whom He has entrusted large wealth, and upon whom He has laid great responsibility. We trust that this end may be attained also during this anniversary year, or at least largely furthered.

Even a larger conception of the duty and responsibility of our Lutheran Church finds expression in the motto adopted by the Central Anniversary Committee that represents the three general bodies, the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South: "The Celebration of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century to Hasten the Transformation of the Twentieth Century." This calls our attention to the world-mission of the Lutheran Church, and this is well. Too long and too much, perhaps, we have been accustomed in this country to think and speak of the mission of the Lutheran Church to Lutherans. We have forgotten that the Reformation was a world movement. We have forgotten

that it was a movement like the founding of the Christian Church in the first three centuries of the Christian era. It was in fact the recovery or re-birth of evangelical Christianity which had been corrupted and obscured by the errors, and false teaching, and superstitious practices of the Church of Rome. The same truths and principles which wrought such a mighty change then are needed to-day to oppose error, to correct false teaching, to right the wrongs of society, and to work a transformation which will be like the coming of the kingdom of God in the world. This is too large a subject for discussion in this paper, but we should ever keep it in the background of all our meetings, and addresses, and writing, and even of our thinking, during this great anniversary year.

4. Still a fourth result to be hoped for from the Quadri-centennial Celebration remains to be considered, that of *unification*. Not much has been said about this, and we do not mean to dwell on it at any great length here. It may be best not to say too much about it. Sometimes the less such things are talked about the sooner they are likely to come to pass. Many Lutherans are very shy of all talk about union, especially organic union. We may not be ready for this yet. It may well be that we will never be ready for an organic union of all in this country who bear the Lutheran name. Our doctrinal differences are not very great, but the linguistic, and national, and traditional differences may be too many and too pronounced ever to be entirely overcome.

But certainly this anniversary ought to bring us closer together. It ought to remove misunderstandings and misapprehensions. It ought to set into the foreground of our thought of each other the things in which we are agreed, and push into the background the things in which we differ. It ought to bring out into the clear the distinctive family traits in all the great Lutheran bodies, and awaken a new and stronger consciousness of family likeness and a spirit of genuine brotherhood. Why should Lutherans stand aloof from each other and look at each other askance, because they do not all think and speak and act exactly alike in every minutia of doctrine



or polity, or in all the forms of worship or methods of work? The members of a family are not all alike. They may differ quite widely in appearance and manner, or in temper and disposition; still they constitute one family, and if they have the true family spirit they will recognize the family relation and live and work together as brethren. Why should not we as Lutherans do the same thing?

If we cannot unite organically in the same general body we can at least recognize each other as brethren of the same household of faith, and co-operate and help each other in many ways. Many enterprises and much work are common to us all. That is, we are all engaged in the same line of work, such as publication, and education, and Home and Foreign Missions, and Inner Mission work, and the founding and maintenance of eleemosynary institutions of various kinds. Co-operation in these would mean not only a great saving of energy and money, but it would also tend to secure largely increased results. Thus we would be doing at least something towards bringing about the answer to our Lord's Prayer that all His disciples may be one even as He and the Father are one.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE II.

MARTIN LUTHER IN THE CHANGING LIGHT OF  
FOUR CENTURIES.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

Just four hundred years have passed since the German Reformation began and Martin Luther stepped upon the stage of world-history. Throughout this period the influence of the great Reformer has never ceased to be felt and his personality is still a determining factor in the evangelical Christianity of today. But during these four centuries there have been many changes in the point of view from which the world has looked at men and things. There have been many variations in the light that men have flashed upon their heroes of the past. As with other figures of heroic stature, so with Martin Luther,—his life and work have been very unevenly estimated in the centuries that have passed since he first attracted the attention of the world. Each age has felt his influence in its own peculiar way. And our own day is not without its distinctive contribution to the estimates that are placed upon the work of the German Reformer.

It may not be amiss, therefore, in this quadricentennial year to take a turn through the history of Protestantism to see with what a variety of color Luther has appeared in the changing light of these four centuries. Luther's varied career during this quadricentennium is really a longitudinal section of the history of thought for the period. It is interesting to note how each distinctive period in the history of these four centuries of Protestantism has translated Luther into the language of its own special type of thought. Then, too, such a review may help us to understand the divergence of opinion

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Church History, held in New York City, December 26, 1916.



that is manifested in various quarters today concerning this man's relation to the modern world.<sup>2</sup>

#### PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION.

Already in his own day Luther had become the object of love and of hate. In the short perspective of a few years men began to see something of the significance of his work. In the burning of the Papal Bull in 1520 the issue was squarely joined and men had to take sides either for Luther or against him. From all ranks and interests came his admirers. The changes that he effected were so far-reaching in their consequences and so varied

2 This paper can deal only with Luther's career among Protestants. It might indeed be an interesting and profitable exercise also to trace the history of the Roman Catholic attitude towards Luther, from Eck and Cochlaeus to Denifle and Grisar. It is doubtful whether much progress could be noted in the Catholic appreciation of Luther during the past four centuries, because that branch of Christendom has persistently closed itself against Luther's influence, particularly his religious influence. And the rich materials that have been gathered by Hegemann ("Luther im katholischen Urteil," Munich, 1906) indicate no serious effort to comprehend Luther or his movement. At any rate, the limitations of our space will not permit the treatment of that part of our subject here.

It is different with the non-Lutheran branches of Protestantism, even with those whose historical beginnings Luther himself opposed in the sixteenth century. They have for the most part moved with the general line of progress in the appreciation of Luther. But of course our sketch can be most easily accomplished and most clearly illustrated in each case by reference to that branch of Protestantism which bears Luther's own name, more particularly those who have lived in Luther's own land.

The information for this sketch is gathered from such secondary sources as:

Eckart, "Luther im Urteile bedeutender Männer."

Dorner, "Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie."

Boehmer, "Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung."

Stephan, "Luther in den Wandlungen seiner Kirche."

McGiffert, "Protestant Thought before Kant."

Moore, "Christian Thought since Kant."

Ritschl, "Geschichte des Pietismus."

Gass, "Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik."

Lichtenberger, "History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century."

Seeberg, "Die Kirche Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert."

Troeltsch, "Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit."

Loofs, "Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit."

Various articles in Hauck's "Realencyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche."

in their character that men of all classes hailed him with acclaim and brought him their tributes of love and esteem.

Many were attracted to the man by his genial personality. Thus Mosellan, one of the scholars of Leipsic, who had come to know Luther personally at the time of the disputation there, says of him in a letter to a friend: "In his life he is kindly and courteous. There is nothing stoical or supercilious about him. He knows how to conduct himself under all circumstances. In society he is gleeful, witty, animated, and always happy. His face is always bright and cheerful, however direful the threats of his enemies. So that it would be hard to believe that this man could undertake such serious things without the favor of God." The same sort of testimony comes from a multitude of other witnesses, people who were personally acquainted with the man Luther. The picturesque element of his character, the biting force of his words, and the dauntless courage of his deeds, while they condemned him severely among his enemies, nevertheless commended him the more heartily to his friends. Throughout his public life Luther manifested a capacity for personal friendship, a talent for binding men to himself by strong personal ties, that is unique among the great Reformers and with few parallels in history. His personality attracted and impressed people with a sense of his extraordinary character and his extraordinary mission.

Some were attracted to the Reformer by his theological views. Among his intellectual admirers, outside the circle of his immediate associates, was no less a person than John Calvin himself, the founder of the other branch of the Reformation. Calvin regarded Luther as his most influential teacher and referred to him as "that distinguished servant of God." Zwingli, too, was drawn by Luther's theology and spoke of him as "the ablest champion of God and the best student of Scriptures that has appeared on earth for a thousand years."



But the circle of Luther's theological friends and intellectual admirers in his own day was small as compared with the number of those who were drawn to him on other grounds. The masses of the people, who had no theological training, did not stop to ponder the theological implications of Luther's words and deeds. This was reserved for a select group of theologians and for those who through their own inner experience, similar to that of Luther, had come to realize the depth of his religious struggle and the wealth of his evangelical faith.

But the masses of Luther's own day did realize that in him the Christian world had one of its most forceful personalities. They did understand that the might of his personality lay in the very vigor of his faith so firmly grounded in the Redeemer and through Him in a gracious God. They did appreciate the fact that in this extraordinary man with his intimate communion with God and his far-reaching principles, Roman Catholic Christianity was for once baffled and beaten because it stood before a religious superior. Those whose personal piety was not strong enough to lead them to rejoice in the religious worth of this man rejoiced at least in their liberation from Papal tyranny, from the dictates of foreigners, and from the tutelage of the priests.

In his work Luther gathered together into one strand the scattered threads of the national and religious longings of his day. Many and varied were the motives that drew men to his cause. Some admired him for religious reasons, some for patriotic reasons, some for scientific and cultural reasons, and some for economic reasons. Sometimes men's admiration for the hero rested simply on an indefinite and unreasoned instinct. So that Luther's name and Luther's personality were more prominent on the banner of the Reformation than any particular article of faith. Says Döllinger, the Roman Catholic historian of a generation ago, speaking of Luther's standing among his own people: "There never was a German who understood his nation so intuitively, and in turn was so thoroughly apprehended by his own people, so completely absorbed by them, we might say, as was the case

with the Augustinian monk of Wittenberg. The spirit and temper of the Germans were as completely under his control as a lyre in the hands of a master musician."

Abundant evidence of Luther's personal popularity in his own generation is to be found in both the popular and the learned literature of his day. Albrecht Dürer, the celebrated artist of that time, in his diary refers to Luther as "the God-inspired man who has helped me out of great tribulations." Hans Sachs, the poet, sings of "the Wittenberg nightingale, whose song is heard in every vale." Michael Stiefel, the mathematician, lauds him as the angel of the book of Revelation (14:6) who flies through the heavens proclaiming an everlasting gospel. And some were so extravagant in their enthusiasm for him as to ascribe to him qualities that transcend humanity and practically make him an object of worship.

Of course Luther had his personal enemies in his own day just as he has had his defamers and detractors ever since that day. The frightful slanders of the Roman Catholics, by which they sought to blacken his name and disparage his cause, began already in Luther's life-time. This was involved in the very nature of the case and does not occasion surprise. Then, too, the fanatical reformers and the anabaptists took offense at Luther's methods and at his attitude towards them. They poured out violent invective against his person and accused him of soft living, of papal pretensions, and of having betrayed a holy cause into the hands of princes and their worldly government. Some of the humanists also, notably Erasmus, who had hoped to regenerate the world by polishing the intellects of men, found no satisfaction in Luther's methods and principles, and gradually developed personal animosity towards him.

But all such speedily lost their influence upon the course of events in that age. For during the active days of the Wittenberg monk, almost the entire spiritual life of his nation gathered about his personality. Those who had their faces set towards the future flocked for the most part to his banner. Failing to do that, they forfeited their leadership or else became the heads of de-



spised "sects" that were destined to remain in comparative insignificance for almost two centuries.

But the heyday of the German Reformation passed and with it Luther's personal popularity declined. The high tide of his popularity occurred in the early twenties, say from the Leipsic Disputation in 1519 to the middle of the third decade. With the outbreak of the Peasants' War in 1525 his favor among the lower classes began to ebb somewhat. For in that social outbreak Luther expressed his lack of confidence in the common man. He stormed against the violence of the peasants and cordially espoused the cause of the princes. This in the end was not without its advantages for Luther's movement, but certainly so far as Luther's personal standing is concerned his attitude in the Peasants' War made him forfeit much of the love with which up to that time he had been regarded by the masses. With this incident, therefore, the Lutheran Reformation entered upon a new phase of its development and the year 1525 draws a sharp line of division between the "earlier" and the "later" Luther as he has been known to subsequent ages.

#### PERIOD OF ORTHODOXY.

Immediately after Luther's death, efforts were made to form conclusive estimates of his personality and of his work. But of course these efforts did not succeed. The funeral addresses of Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, and Cölius, the *vita Lutheri* with which Melanchthon prefaced the second volume of the Wittenberg edition of Luther's works, and the *historia Lutheri* of Luther's physician Ratzeberger, only reflect the personal impressions of these admiring friends; they do not indicate any thorough-going appreciation of his historical significance. And the earliest historians of the Reformation, Myconius, Spalatin, and Sleidan did not sound the depths of Luther's spirit or discern the epochal character of the Reformation as a movement. The events themselves were still too near for their proper estimation.

A slight degree of progress in the objective characterization of the German Reformer is marked by the famous series of seventeen sermons preached by John Mathesius in 1562-1564. Mathesius, too, was a personal acquaintance of Luther's. It cannot be said that he understood the real heart of his hero or the true import of his work. But he gives a chronological narrative of the events in Luther's life which has served as an important source of information for all subsequent biographers. His account abounds in terms of endearment and of extravagant admiration. He dwells upon Luther's humility of spirit, his keen sense of sinfulness, and the joyfulness of his implicit faith. He regards the Reformer as a great Prophet and places him in a class with men like Moses and Elijah and Paul. At the same time he is not blind to the very human qualities and the faults of his hero, but he seriously attempts a psychological explanation of the man's character with its many sides. The most important achievement of Luther Mathesius finds in his recovery of the pure doctrine, and herein Mathesius is typical of the second half of the sixteenth century. He marks the transition from the age of personal acquaintanceship with Luther to the age of the Protestant schoolmen.

For the next century brought a period of sharp theological controversy and consequent doctrinal crystallization. It was the age of neo-scholasticism, often called the age of orthodoxy. Precise theological formulation was the order of the day. The Church was now regarded as a school for the teaching of sound doctrine. The most important result of the sixteenth century Reformation was found in the rediscovery of the primitive Gospel and the purification of Christian doctrine. The chief merit of Martin Luther was seen in his restoration of the true Catholic faith and his heroic struggle against theological error. Thus under the epigonous spirit of the seventeenth century, the popular conception of Luther is changed from that of a vigorous prophet of the living faith to that of a huge Professor of Dogmatics. The title of prophet continues indeed to be applied to him but the spirit of the prophet is completely gone from the picture.



The picture of Luther which the student would draw from the literature of the Protestant scholasticism of the seventeenth century is a peculiarly distorted one. The wrong features are in the foreground. The wrong elements are emphasized. Incidents and qualities which in reality were only accidents in Luther's character or limitations in his personality, tenacious heritages of the past or necessary products of his struggle with the Catholics and the radicals, are here painted as the distinctive characteristics of the man and of his work. There was no genuine effort to comprehend the real mission of the man, no attempt to analyze his real power. The theory was preconceived and the facts were forced to fit. There was zeal enough on behalf of the Reformer, but it was zeal without knowledge, a zeal that spent itself in cataloguing his superficial merits and in stringing out his individual achievements. There was not the slightest intimation anywhere that Luther stood in the forefront of a movement by which the Christian religion entered upon a new stage of its development.

To judge from the frequent mention of Luther's name and the many references to his work in the age of Protestant scholasticism one might think that his spirit ruled the age. But as a matter of fact the age laid all its emphasis upon Luther's individual words and deeds, upon externalities of all kinds, and received very little impress of his personality. His message was not apprehended. His views were not seriously studied. His writings were not read. It is a significant fact that after the Wittenberg and Jena editions of Luther's works had been issued and reprinted several times during the second half of the sixteenth century, with the year 1600 the demand for the works of the Reformer suddenly ceased and did not appear again until far into the eighteenth century. It is true a new edition of ten volumes was issued at Altenburg in 1661-1664. But this was a very incomplete edition, was published by order of the Altenburg Count Frederick William, was edited by his court preacher, Sagittarius, and found very little sale. Its publication, therefore, did not indicate any real demand for the writings of Luther.



Luther was praised and glorified in the literature of the day. His honor was stamped on coins and carved on houses. He was magnified to heroic stature and saintliness, and was classed among the prophets and apostles of Bible times. But he was always translated into the spirit of scholasticism and orthodoxy. Had he not recovered and proclaimed and spread abroad the precious system of pure doctrine? Had he not triumphed over the Pope and forced the strangle-hold of the priests who had held the pure doctrine in bondage? That there were contradictions among Luther's own theological views does not seem to have occurred to the Protestant schoolmen. Were there not in his works proof-passages a-plenty for any proposition of sound doctrine that needed to be maintained? That Luther's theological positions did not in all cases coincide with the dogmas of Lutheran Orthodoxy was not discovered until the following century. Sufficient unto the day was to dogmatize and to systematize, to collect and to collate.

The greatest dogmaticians of the day claimed to be the direct successors of Luther, and this claim was generally conceded by their contemporaries. Leonhard Hutter received the honorary title "*redonatus Lutherus*." His book entitled "*A Grammar of the German Language Collected from Luther's German Bible and from His Other Books*" held sway in both the Protestant and the Catholic schools through most of the seventeenth century. He was a staunch controversialist for Luther and against Melancthon and the Reformed, but like all the other theologians of this scholastic age, he employed the method of loci, of which Melancthon himself had set the example. So there was no demand for an organic comprehension of Luther's theological system.

Thus Luther has become the heroic champion of sound doctrine. His own beautiful emblem, expressing the very heart of the Gospel, has fallen into forgetfulness, and in the Luther coins of the day he is represented as holding a burning light over an open Bible. Probably no single verse was a greater favorite in the seventeenth century than this:



Wird vergehen nimmermehr."

"Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr

On a house that was built just three years before the century began, the verse occurs in this form:

"Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr

Vergehet nun und nimmermehr

Und ob's gleich bisse noch so sehr

Die Calvinisten an ihr Ehr."

And one of the coins epitomizes the sentiment of the age in these words: "Gross was er im Leben, grösser im Reden, der Grösste aber im Lehren."

One of the stragglers of this age of Protestant Orthodoxy was John Albert Fabricius, Professor in Helmstedt. His last work was his *Centifolium Lutheranismi*, Hamburg, 1728 and 1730. This is a systematic bibliography of all Luther literature and of all incidental references to Luther in the writings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is topically arranged and uniformly disposed. Its two hundred chapters cover more than nine hundred pages of disconnected quotations concerning Luther's life, his personal qualities, his achievements, his exemplary positions, and so forth. This work is a faithful reflection of the spirit of the seventeenth century which, so far as Luther is concerned, was an age of the *Epigoni*, an age that fairly apotheosized the hero of the preceding century, an age of zeal without knowledge, an age of blind devotion that brought forth lifeless catalogues and excerpt quotations cut to order but did not penetrate to the living heart and the glowing spirit of the man.

#### PERIOD OF PIETISM.

In the next century, the century immediately preceding Kant, two distinctive types of thought run side by side, Pietism and Rationalism. In England, the rationalistic movement was somewhat older than the pietistic; in Germany the order was the reverse. The pietistic movement originated in Germany and spread to England

where it received its most striking expression in the great evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. The rationalistic movement originated in England and spread to the continent, in Germany taking the name of illuminism (*die Aufklärung*).

Both the pietists of Germany and the evangelicals of England claimed to be in accord with the true spirit and teaching of Martin Luther. Luther no longer received that abject obeisance as a doctrinal authority which he had received in the preceding period, but there was a distinct consciousness of spiritual relationship with the great Reformer. And while there was a one-sided emphasis upon certain aspects of his life and work, nevertheless it is clear that the pietists approached the real heart of Martin Luther much more nearly than the schoolmen had done.

The pietists based their religious life upon their inner experience. Herein they could take Luther as an example, for the very force of his protest grew out of the inner necessity of his spiritual life. By the practical nature of their religion the pietists led men back from dogma to the Bible and laid new emphasis on the personal elements in Christianity. Instead of faith in the doctrine of Christ's Person and Work, they insisted upon faith in the living form of our Lord. Now these are the very features which would lead men to an understanding not only of Luther's Christianity, his work and his teachings, but also of his personality and his inmost spirit.

We are not surprised, therefore, to find men during this period zealously reading Luther's works, and not merely reading about him and cataloguing quotations concerning him and gathering disconnected excerpts from his writings. There was a real demand now for his works themselves. As over against the single poor edition of Luther's works which appeared in the seventeenth century, the eighteenth century witnessed the publication of two worthy editions of his complete works, the Leipsic edition (1729-1740) and the Walch edition (1750-1753). The Latin works of the Reformer were now for the first time all translated into German. It is clear that



Luther's works were being read, and that, too, with appreciation. Some few of his writings were finding their way into other languages than the German. On both sides of the Channel men began to call upon Luther in support of their positions. The personal influence of the Reformer was coming to life again after its sleep under the cold formalism of the seventeenth century.

John Wesley, the leader among English pietists, relates in his journal that his conversion took place one evening at a meeting of one of those societies which in England corresponded to the German *collegia pietatis* of Spener and Francke. Wesley's conversion, that epochal event which made him the leader of English evangelism, occurred, he himself tells us, "about a quarter before nine" while "one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans." Quite directly, therefore, Luther's religious influence, resurrected from scholasticism and refurnished in the spirit of pietism, led to the great evangelical revival of the eighteenth century in England. In Luther's spiritual struggle men found the mirror of their own inner experience, and that fact, in a day of one-sided subjectivity, served as a strong magnet to draw men to him.

Another appreciative English reader of Luther in this period, kindred in spirit to the pietists especially in the supremely practical aim of his religion, was John Bunyan. He writes thus of Luther's commentary on Galatians: "The God in whose hands are all our days and ways did cast into my hand one day a book of Martin Luther's. It was his comment on Galatians. . . . . When I had but a little way perused, I found my condition in his experience so largely and profoundly handled, as if his book had been written out of my heart. . . . . I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon the Galatians (except the Holy Bible) before all the books that ever I have seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience."

But of course the pietists of Germany were the ones who felt most keenly their spiritual relationship with Luther. Spener, Francke, Arnold, Bengel, Zinzendorf,—all are loud in their praise of the Reformer and keen in

their appreciation of his religious experiences. They are fond of picturing his terrible spiritual struggle and the severe temptations he endured. They never tire of emphasizing the religious worth of the man. They delight to picture his inner development though of course not in any genetic historical sense. All the insight and power of his Reformation they derive from his personal experience of religion. And herein they hit upon an important truth.

Spener heartily recommended the study of Luther's writings and placed them next to the Bible as means of devotion. Luther's chief merit he found in the rediscovery of the pure Gospel. He tries to characterize Luther with a list of "seven genuine gifts of the Holy Spirit" which were "imparted to the dear man in full measure." These are great learning, fine eloquence, untiring diligence, fervent love for God and man, an exemplary life, and patience that was always rejoicing. Similar sentiments are expressed by Francke with special emphasis upon the restoration of the primitive Gospel. Gottfried Arnold, in one of the chapters of his "Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie," presents a description of Luther's character and an evaluation of his work that may be regarded as unexcelled until the days of Herder.

From their first-hand knowledge of the man through his writings the pietists were able to call him to their service in various ways. In their condemnation of philosophy and worldly wisdom they introduced Luther as their chief witness. In justification of their conventicles they pointed to the passage in the German missal where Luther refers to the intimate circle of "those who are seriously concerned about their Christian life" (*die mit Ernst Christen sein wollen*). In their depreciation of the stated church services they could quote words from Luther that seem to support their position. At many points they came into conflict with the belated representatives of the age of orthodoxy, and here the pietists always sought to exorcise the weakening spirit of scholasticism by calling upon the true spirit of Martin Luther.



In the sharp controversy between the pietists of Halle and the orthodox of Wittenberg, both sides claimed to be the true followers of Luther, and on this point the controversy was waged. Pastor Seidel came to Spener's aid with his "*Lutherus redivivus*" in which Luther is set forth in his own words as a vigorous antagonist of congealed orthodoxy. Schwentzel wrote a book to prove that Luther was Spener's predecessor and that Spener was Luther's true successor. While a treatise from the pen of a pastor Jung proceeds to show that Count Zinzendorf is the living and victorious embodiment of Martin Luther.

Thus intimately did the pietists as a class feel themselves related to the spirit and temper of Luther. But there was far less uniformity of conception, far more independence of thought, among the pietists than there had been among their orthodox fathers. The frigid objectivity of neo-scholasticism had melted away before the glowing passion of subjective religion. This perfervid subjectivism it was impossible to retain in uniform moulds. The inner religious experience of the individual had rendered him largely independent of any external human authorities in matters of religion. Consequently Luther was no longer accepted as the supreme and sole authority. In fact the leading representatives of the pietistic movement did not regard it as a sacrilege to point out Luther's limitations, his weaknesses, and even his actual faults. Criticisms of his character and of his work are not wanting among the pietists. These criticisms are important because they indicate the first efforts at a psychological-historical understanding of the Reformer's personality and of his mission.

They strongly opposed the virtual apotheosis which many in the age of orthodoxy had applied to Luther. They emphasized the fact that the Reformer, great as were his merits, nevertheless was only a man and very human at that. They did not try to cover over his weaknesses but frankly admitted and deplored them. They protested against the practice of placing him in a class with the apostles and other Bible heroes. The puritanic and ascetic strain in the pietistic movement manifested itself

in criticism of Luther's cheerful disposition and his enjoyment of the pleasures of life. Professor Herrnschmidt of Halle expresses a longing for a Luther "cleansed of all impurities," and the impurities are found on close inspection to be his sharp temper and his tendency to jest.

Sometimes the criticisms went deeper and laid hold on Luther's work itself. The pietists frequently complained that Luther laid too much emphasis upon doctrine and was too dogmatic and severe in the theological discussions of his day. They also found fault with his translation of the Bible. New work in the languages and a new method of exegesis had brought to light many a weakness in Luther's translation. Some of the pietistic leaders set themselves to work, each in his own way, to improve the translation but nothing noteworthy resulted from their efforts. The free spirit of historical criticism which Luther had exercised with reference to the books of the Bible had completely escaped the notice of the orthodox in the seventeenth century. Its memory was revived by the pietists but in general it was disapproved. Luther was held to be in error in his judgment concerning the book of Revelation and the Epistle of James.

One of the pietists, Konrad Dippel, in his criticism of Luther and his work, went so far as to draw up a complete "register of Luther's sins," and prominent among the shadows of the great man's image he placed his passionate temperament, his coarseness, his dogmatic attitude in matters of doctrine, and his dependence on the worldly government. But all these criticisms are to be understood as indications of the subjective individualism and the religious independence of the age, and taken together with the high words of appreciation that came from this same class of men, they indicate merely an honest effort at a historical understanding of the man and a sincere desire to enter into personal relationship with him.

But how were the pietists to combine in their own thought both their praise and their criticism of Luther? This was long before the historical science had taught



men to distinguish between the permanent content of a movement and its transient form. The most convenient way, therefore, to account for the combination of virtues and faults in Luther's reformatory activity was to distinguish between a younger and an older Luther. This distinction the pietists wrought out with great care. The sharp break between the two Luthers was generally agreed to have taken place during Luther's controversy with Carlstadt. The younger Luther the pietists claimed for themselves while the other Luther they left to the orthodox. They enthused over the young Samson who had triumphed over parsons and Philistines, the young man of invincible courage and of deep spiritual power. But they freely criticised and rejected the middle-aged and the older Luther, the man of dogma, allied with the nobles and princes, the jovial man of song and drink. Not infrequently in the controversy between the pietists and the orthodox, when one of the debaters would cite Luther, it would be demanded: "Which Luther did you mean?" This was characteristic.

It is not too much, therefore, to say that with the pietists the spirit of criticism was awakening in refreshing contrast to the blind enthusiasm and the unreasoning hate of previous generations. A more scholarly interest in the life and deeds of Luther began to be manifested. And the age of pietism first drew the distinction between Lutherism and Lutheranism.

#### PERIOD OF RATIONALISM.

Close upon the heels of pietism came the age of enlightenment with its rationalists and deists. In England pietism followed rationalism and largely robbed it of its influence upon the future. But in Luther's own land pietism came first and rationalism afterwards, with the consequence that rationalism remained to influence the thought and the theology of Germany far more profoundly and permanently than it influenced that of England. The impulse to German rationalism came from across the Channel and was promoted in Germany particularly by the philosophy of Leibniz and Wolff. It was the spirit of the Renaissance resurrected and now pru-

dentially allied with the spirit of Protestantism. But the German rationalists were not unrelated to the pietists. The two groups fought side by side against the cold formalism of orthodoxy. They both found a congenial home in Halle. They both united in a demand for the publication and distribution of Luther's works and they both preferred the younger Luther. But in their interpretation of Luther's personality and work they sometimes agreed, sometimes greatly diverged.

Strange as it may seem, the rationalists found many things in Luther to approve. They overlooked the fact that he had persistently condemned human reason and had pronounced it the devil's bride. They overlooked his insistence upon a personal experience of sin and of divine grace and they overlooked some of the outstanding characteristics of his forceful personality, in order that they might draw near to him in admiration and esteem.

In contrast with the pietists the illuminists loudly applauded Luther's alliance with the princes and the government. They only deplored the fact that he sometimes launched such severe attacks against certain individuals among the princes. And one of the writers of this period regards it as the one indelible stain on Luther's life that he used such sharp tones in his controversy with Henry VIII. But Luther's generally friendly attitude towards the princes and later his dependence upon them, a fact which has been a ground of offense to so many during these four centuries, the rationalists cordially commended. These men laid great stress upon the privileges of citizenship and the practical duties to the state, and in the religious coloring of Luther's political ideas they found a welcome confirmation of their own emphasis upon political virtues.

Another point in which the rationalists deviated from the judgment of the pietists was concerning the joys and pleasures of life. The rationalists were utter strangers to the ascetic ideals of the pietists and they heartily approved of Luther's joviality and his love of pleasure. They gloried in the refreshing figure of one who had extricated himself from formalism and legalism of every kind,



moral as well as religious. They took delight in quoting his witticisms, in describing his engagement and marriage and family life, and in picturing his recreation hours.

The rationalists were thoroughly at home in the work-a-day world. Theirs was a sort of religious pragmatism. The test of religion they saw in its usefulness. And from Luther's practical piety, which imparted a halo to every common task, they took encouragement in their own efforts at a practical religion.

This feature in the rationalistic appraisal of Luther is very evident from the character of the quotations from his writings that occur most frequently among the rationalists. His letters were preferred, doubtless because of their occasionalistic character. The special selections that were gathered from his works for separate publication indicate the practical turn of the times. Bretschneider published his "Luther's Message to Our Times" and Lindner his "Useful Material from Luther's Writings." And in these collections Luther is made to speak not as a theologian nor as a Reformer, but as a "good teacher, a faithful friend, an affectionate father, a public educator, and a useful citizen." His words were so selected and arranged as to present practical instruction on such varied subjects as the art of studying, the science of Biblical interpretation, directions for preaching, for catechising, for raising children, for good citizenship, thoughts on plagiarism, on the value of domestic industries, on gymnastics, and so forth. Surely there was no lack of regard for Luther's practical turn of mind. But this awkward appreciation of Luther as a practical man of affairs almost completely ignored the heart of Luther's piety which had its origin in the assurance of God's grace and was so thoroughly religious in its orientation that the non-religious factors in civilization were quite secondary and entirely peripheral in his thought.

But the rationalists glorified Luther most of all as the hero of freedom, freedom of conscience, freedom from the thralldom of the papacy, freedom from the strangling dogmas, the priestly ceremonies, and the ecclesiastical

power of Catholicism. The Roman Catholic view of the world was diametrically opposed to the fundamental principles of rationalism. The increasing influence of the Jesuits was offensive to these champions of human reason, these enemies of all external authority. They were loud, therefore, in their praise of the sixteenth century hero who had burst the fetters of ecclesiastical bondage and had broken the shackles which bound the consciences of men. This was the strongest strain in their references to Luther, his achievement on behalf of the freedom of conscience.

This may be seen most clearly from the last volume of Walch's edition of Luther's works. Walch himself was a peculiar mixture of orthodox, pietist, and rationalist. In his twenty-fourth volume he presents in great detail a biography and a characterization of Luther, together with a register of his achievements. The climax of Luther's achievements he calls his liberation of the human conscience. And so from the middle of the century Luther is the veritable herald of illuminism. Even Frederick the Great who had regarded the "mad monk" as a "barbarous writer" is ready to style him the Liberator of his country. This thought found a hearty welcome in every rationalist mind. It occupied a prominent place in the tercentennial of 1817, and today it still resounds in various quarters.

But with all their admiration of Luther as a champion of free thought the rationalists asserted their own independence of thought by freely criticising him. They deprecated his severe dealings with those who did not agree with him. In his attitude towards the Swiss theologians they found him guilty of narrow-mindedness and dogmatism. They severely criticized his literary style or lack of style, and regarded his influence upon the German language as deplorable. But many of these things they sought to excuse by pointing to Luther's historical background.

Some of the rationalists expressed a greater admiration for Erasmus than for Luther. And Semler even went so far as to say that neither Luther nor Zwingli nor



Melanchthon had ever discovered or introduced a single new idea, while Erasmus had accomplished more for religion and theology than all the rest of them together. Other criticisms were directed against his catechisms and his translation of the Bible. Like the pietists, only more systematically, the rationalists undertook a new translation. But this also failed. Nevertheless, new catechisms were published, and Luther's hymns were "corrected" and "improved." Thus the criticisms, like the indorsements for the most part touched only the surface and did not reach the real heart and purpose of the man.

The religious value of Luther the rationalists found in his "search for truth" in his "zeal for knowledge." There is not the least effort to comprehend the deep inner struggle which Luther passed through and which alone furnishes a key to the understanding of Luther's development and of his life. His personal struggles in the cloister the rationalists grouped with his sickness. Nowhere among these devotees of reason was there the slightest appreciation of the strategic importance of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone. His service to religion, they said, consisted in his courageous opposition to the Papists, his liberal criticism of the Bible, and his redemption of human conscience from bondage to external authority.

Thus the age of rationalism repeats the process of translating Luther into the terms of its own ideals. Nevertheless the work of the rationalists in their estimates of Luther marks an advance in the progressive understanding of the Reformer's personality and work. They came nearer to a psychological analysis of the man and a historical appreciation of his work than any previous age had done. And the advance that is seen most distinctly in their appreciation of the man grows out of the fact that in their effort to claim him for their cause it was necessary for them to go back of his doctrinal system and his individual words and deeds and his separate achievements and merits, back to the real spirit of the man and his fundamental impelling motives. Whether

this was done successfully or not, the effort itself marks progress.

#### PERIOD OF ROMANTICISM.

Now with the turn from the eighteenth century to the nineteenth we enter upon an entirely new stage in the history of thought. This most recent age is an age of romanticism in literature, of idealism in philosophy, of liberalism in theology, and of historical inquiry in everything. Under the influence of this new age, every aspect of religion has been reconsidered. Christianity has come under a new interpretation. Our understanding of the sixteenth century Reformation has been taken under critical review. And our picture of Luther has been drafted anew. The new picture is not yet completed: the process of reinterpretation is still going on.

The nineteenth century is remarkable for the variety of spiritual streams that run side by side through the century. And yet this very complication of movements, this very diversity of intellectual and cultural environment, has brought us to a completer understanding of the German Reformer than could otherwise have been attained. Hitherto each age with its comparative uniformity of strain and sentiment, as we have seen, has emphasized some one aspect of Luther's personality or some single feature of his work. The Reformer has stood successively in the various colors of the spectrum. It has been the mission of the past century and a quarter to combine the colors and to shed on Luther the full light of day, to overcome the limited vision and one-sidedness of viewpoint and to give us the full Luther standing out in stereoscopic relief. The full history of this interesting but complex process would require a stately volume. We can attempt here only the barest suggestion of a sketch.

The various estimates of Luther that have come to the front since the birth of Kant's critical philosophy may be gathered into three general groups. The first group is characterized by the prevalence of romanticism and ceased to predominate after the overthrow of Napoleon.



The second group is characterized by the prevalence of liberalism or neo-rationalism, and predominated during the middle portion of the last century. The third and most recent period begins roughly with the quadricentennial year of 1883. In this period we are still involved.

The high tide of romanticism claimed many of the contemporaries of Kant, such as Lessing and Klopstock, Herder and Hamann. Lessing was still under the influence of rationalism. But he never idealized Luther as did most of the rationalists. He was frankly conscious of a wide divergence between his own religious views and those of Luther. Nevertheless, Lessing loved Luther for his personality, and he exclaimed: "The evidences of humanity that I find in him are as precious and instructive to me as all his shining perfections." This is characteristic and at the same time significant. The rationalists as a group looked upon life from the point of view of the aesthetic ideal. They set up an entirely new conception of personality. They held that the measure of individual genius is to be found not in a man's moral perfections, nor in his practical usefulness, nor even in his intellectual attainments, but in the originality, symmetry and force of his nature. Such a standard of judgment found excellent material in Martin Luther.

The romanticists, therefore, protested against the rationalistic criticism of Luther's language and literature. Klopstock, in particular, placed the sixteenth century Reformer on a level with Shakespeare as a literary genius and poetically asserted that Luther had "made the language of the Fatherland a language of men and of angels." Hamann, on the other hand, without discerning any great intrinsic worth in Luther's compositions and translations, nevertheless discovered that great and powerful personalities are always inclined to paradoxes and so he delighted in Luther's exaggerations, his contradictions, and his harshnesses.

The height of German poetry was reached in Goethe and Schiller, the poets of classic idealism. But neither of them made any real progress in the interpretation of Luther's historical significance. Goethe, it is true, had

a lively admiration for Luther's work in his victorious struggle with the papal hierarchy, in his translation of the Bible, and in his return to the original teachings of Christ. But in his evaluation of Luther's personality Goethe comes entirely under the spell of romanticism. After defining genius as "creative force" capable of bringing forth deeds that endure, he says of Luther: "He was a genius of a very remarkable kind; he has made his influence felt this many a day and it is impossible to reckon the days or the centuries when his creative force will cease to be felt." Beyond these superficial generalities the great poet had no penetrative insight into Luther's historical function. And Schiller, too, despite his general historical interest, makes no advance upon Goethe in his appreciation of the German Reformer. These poets saw Luther's sole significance in the fact that he was the father of German Protestantism.

The philosophers of the period, Kant and Fichte, made no important advance upon the views of the other writers, so far as the appraisal of Luther is concerned.

But there was one writer in this period who sounded a note that has continued to ring to our own day. Gottfried Herder it was who pointed out that it is not sufficient merely to indulge in general terms of praise for Luther, not sufficient merely to refer to the splendid truths that he uttered or to the mighty deeds that he wrought. If we are to gather anything worth while from Luther's life it is of supreme importance, says Herder, that we understand his position in the connected course of history. We can measure his significance only if we examine his words and deeds in the light of their historical conditions. Luther had actually felt the Word of God not only in the great events of universal history, but also in his own individual experience. No one can really know Luther, therefore, unless he penetrates to the very depths of his soul and approaches his life from within. The important thing in history is not the mere knowledge of the truth, but the inner appropriation of it and the outward application of it. This is the key to the understanding of Luther's character and conduct, and the ap-



plication of this standard to Luther's life and work marks him as a genuine genius, a true hero of history, a decided agent of progress. These ideas of Herder's, hidden for a while even in his own later thought, were destined to exert a powerful influence upon the Luther literature of a later period.

The period of romanticism, we may say, therefore, by its emphasis upon aesthetic personality and by its new conception of genius blazed the way to a deeper understanding of Luther's peculiarities. By preparing the ground for a better development of the entire science of history, by cultivating among the intellectual classes a genuine historical sense and a high regard for the super-sensible and the personal in history, it pointed out the road and invited men to travel to a fuller evaluation of Luther's mission in the history of civilization.

#### PERIOD OF LIBERALISM AND CRITICISM.

After the overthrow of Napoleon the theologians occupy the foreground of our interest in the appraisement of Luther. And here it is not the students of Church History who contributed most to our understanding of Luther, but the representatives of Systematic Theology. Only gradually did the theologians find their way to Luther. Their orientation was for a long time philosophical rather than historical. But slowly the suggestions of the younger Herder were taken up again and wrought into practice, and then the period of the historical perspective had set in. Then at every turn the problems multiplied, step by step the investigation progressed, and our understanding of the Reformer deepened.

The theology of the nineteenth century is largely pervaded by the spirit of Schleiermacher. But so far as Luther is concerned Schleiermacher is not typical of the views of the theologians. He had no consistent or sustained interest in Luther. It is evident that he studied Luther's works but concerning Luther himself his utterances are entirely occasionalistic. For example, when Claus Harms published his ninety-five theses, Schleier-

macher took occasion to contrast them with Luther's and to point out that Luther's theses were without passion or vanity and had sprung from pure zeal and earnest prayer. Otherwise the tercentennial called forth no distinctive utterance from the great theologian. Again, when Frederick William III was trying to force his new *Agende* on the Church and cited Luther in support of the idea, Schleiermacher felt impelled to point out that the genuine spirit of Luther would revolt against such a procedure. Beyond this there is very little from Schleiermacher about Luther. No, the father of nineteenth century theology did not seek a historical foundation for his type of piety or his theological system.

After Schleiermacher came a group of speculative theologians. They took their cue primarily from Hegel. This when applied to history brought them to ideas similar to those of Herder. They took up the rich heritage that was left by Herder and the romanticists and greatly enriched it before they passed it on. Typical of this class is Ferdinand Christian Baur. Theologically Baur was not at all related to Luther. But he realized that in every great movement there must be an individual factor as well as general factors, a forceful personal spirit as well as favorable general conditions. And in Luther's soul he saw the source of the new religious life that was begotten by the Reformation. Then, too, Baur had a new appreciation of Luther's own inner development. He realized that Luther had become a Reformer in the course of his long struggle for the inner assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. Baur, therefore, distinguishes carefully between the earlier and the later Luther, and he accounts for that difference by pointing to his inner development under the influence of the times and of his individuality. This was a decided step forward.

Influences from both Schleiermacher and Baur united to produce a class of theologians known as the liberalists *par excellence*. Their views were strongly tinged with rationalism, only under the growing influence of historical criticism they were robbed of the spirit of assurance and dogmatism with which the older rationalists had as-



serted their attitude. The neo-rationalists laid emphasis upon the practical virtues of Luther and made special application of them to their own advanced political views. At the same time, however, they asserted their independence of Luther in matters of religion and contrasted their own pure Protestantism with the mediaeval elements that remained in Luther's system.

A good illustration of the views of the liberalists may be found in Heinrich Lang. In his characterization of Luther he applied the most intensive criticism that the subject had ever received. He sought out the Roman Catholic sources of Luther's Christianity and tried to show in each case their historical or psychological derivation. Luther's emphasis upon the Bible and his experience of justification by faith Lang regards as due to the essential limitations of his nature imposed by his historical antecedents. It was the tragedy of Luther's life that he sought to overthrow mediaeval Catholicism and yet himself remained embedded in it. For his entire religious disposition and his fundamental ideas belong to Catholicism, and the only Protestant element about him is his struggle with the hierarchy on behalf of religious liberty and freedom of theological inquiry. The essence of the Protestant is to be found rather in Zwingli, Carlstadt, the leaders of the Anabaptists, and the rebellious peasants. All these ideas of Lang's became very important a little later.

Parallel with these liberalists ran a very different group. This was a group of new Lutherans who looked up to Luther again as a Church Father. They were the confessionally orthodox. The group includes such men as Stahl, Vilmar, Philippi, Löhe, Kliefoth, and Kahnis. Their advance upon the old orthodoxy of the seventeenth century lay in the fact that they broke with the old view that Luther's greatest merit was the restoration of pure doctrine. They had some appreciation of the forward look in Luther's movement. In that connection Vilmar says: "Luther's experience of sin and divine grace introduced into the history of Christian piety an entirely new experience and one that had never been known be-

fore." This serves to indicate how the older movements, when reprinted from time to time, show the effects of the general progress that has taken place since their last appearance.

Between these two groups, the liberalists and the neo-orthodox, was the so-called mediating school. The theologians of this school laid emphasis on the simplicity of Luther's biblical faith and the purity of his religion. This group included several merited biographers of Luther, such as Koestlin and Kawerau.

Mention at least must be made of the Erlangen school, fathered by Conrad von Hofmann, and numbering such men as Franz Delitzsch, Theodosius Harnack, and Theodore Kolde. Here the chief effort is to interpret the inner religious consciousness of the Reformer rather than his theological system. From this school came the "modern positive" theology under the leadership of Seeberg. The modern positive theologians have been zealous apologists for Luther against Roman Catholic attacks but they have worked along the same general lines as the Erlangen school and have made no distinctive contribution to our understanding of Luther.

Quite new and significant for our study is the attitude of the founder of Ritschlianism. With Albrecht Ritschl for the first time in the nineteenth century the figure of Martin Luther occupies a really prominent position in the intensive thought of the theologians. In Ritschlianism the apathy of Schleiermacher is overcome. Ritschl's theology was orientated in Luther and based on the consciousness that in Christ we experience a gracious God. Ritschl himself was consciously Lutheran, not in a confessional sense but in a religious sense, and he strove to deepen the Lutheran consciousness of the Church. His students testify that his lectures breathed the very spirit of the Reformation and actually impelled them to a study of Luther and the Lutheran confessions. The results are seen in the Ritschlian school. The systematic theologian of the school, William Herrmann, indicates his attitude by the very title of his chief work: "Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott im Anschluss an Luther darges-



tellt." It is this school also that has given us such appreciative students of Luther as Brieger, Loofs, Karl Müller, and Adolf Harnack.

Under the influence of Ritschl and his followers, therefore, the long theological movement which began with Schleiermacher was turned away from occasionalistic partiality and epigonous externality to an intensive and determining scholarly interest in the whole Luther, kernel and husk. Never before since the days of the Reformation itself have the dogmaticians interested themselves so keenly in historical studies. Never before in the history of Protestantism have the problems concerning Luther and the Reformation engaged so many scholarly hands or received so much scholarly energy and insight as in this generation of Ritschlians. Never before has there been attained such a diversity of view on details and such a uniformity of conception on the main points as that which our own day possesses in its heritage from the nineteenth century. But that brings us to the present situation.

#### THE PRESENT.

In 1883, at the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth, the inspiration and the utensils were at hand for unusual achievements in Luther research. The utensils were prepared by Ranke's school in Germany and its offspring, the Oxford school in England, whose leaders were Stubbs and Creighton. These critical methods were now being applied also in the field of Church History.

The inspiration to this new era in Luther research came from several sources. It came partly from the general historical interest of all theologians at that time, partly from the quadricentennial itself, and partly from the publication in 1877 of the first volume of the Catholic Janssen's work, "Die Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters," which in 1883 appeared in its eighth edition. The result was that in a very short time there arose a numerous group of vigorous scholars who began with critical hand to lay hold on the problem that had been raised, to satisfy the interests

that had been aroused, and to arrive at an undistorted and truthful picture of the Reformer and the Reformation. This group includes such men as Knaake, Enders, Kolde, Kawerau, Brieger, Tschackert, Buchwald, and Walther. If any additional inspiration had been needed so far as the Catholic polemic is concerned it would have been furnished by the more recent works of Denifle and Grisar.

The material results of the investigations in this latest period have been much larger than that of all other periods combined. The Weimar edition of Luther's works, numbering now sixty-five large volumes, stands upon the very pinnacle of achievement in intensive Luther research and embodies the results of scholarly investigations that extend far beyond the boundaries of Germany. There is not a phase of Luther's life, nor an aspect of his theology, nor a department of his literary activity, that has not been made the object of special research and the subject of a separate monograph in the Luther literature of the past thirty-five years. Luther's relation to his contemporaries and the relation of his movement to other movements in the sixteenth century has occupied a special body of literature and has called forth fruitful controversy.

In general it may be said that this last period of research is bringing us nearer and nearer to a definite, concrete and complete picture of Martin Luther, his personality and his work. And through it all nothing is clearer than the many-sidedness of the Reformer and the complicated character of his Reformation in its significance for the modern world. This is why there are so many different views today concerning Luther and the Reformation, even among those who are acquainted with the facts. Each man according to his point of view, each group according to its particular persuasion, selects for emphasis some one characteristic or group of characteristics in the man, some one stage or period in his development, some one feature or group of features in his movement. Even most of the differences among those who bear his name today in this country and in Europe



can be understood on this ground. There is a real need today for a composite photograph of all true views so that we may see the whole Luther.

A Lutheran minister, the Rev. W. N. Harley, of Columbus, Ohio, has recently published a very readable book called "Little Journeys with Martin Luther," in which by means of a fascinating story he shows from the very words of Luther himself that Luther could not be admitted today to any of the large general bodies of Lutherans in America. With equal ease and grace it could be shown from Luther's words that he could be admitted to every one of those bodies, such was the versatility of the man, so many were the phases and stages of his work.

The varying judgments upon Luther that are to be found in the Protestant literature of our own day are to be explained in part, therefore, by the varying emphasis that is placed upon the different stages of his development. And no other aspect of the general subject has received so much attention in recent years as the history of Luther's inner development. Some idea of the significance of this fact may be gathered from the latest German biography of Luther. This is by Otto Scheel of Tübingen. The first volume of Scheel's Luther appeared this year. The whole work bears the sub-title, "From Catholicism to the Reformation," and the first volume traces Luther's development to July 17, 1505, his entrance into the cloister at Erfurt. In Koestlin's life of Luther, which has had the widest sale and study of all biographies since 1883, these first twenty-two years in Luther's life cover only forty-five pages; in Scheel's work they cover three hundred and one pages. Scheel's purpose in his thorough-going scientific work is to describe only Luther's development from a Roman Catholic to a full-fledged Reformer. It is not evident as yet at what point Scheel regards that development as completed. But it is very evident that the interest and the emphasis centers upon the younger Luther and particularly his inner evolution.

This suggests another question, one that is in the very forefront of scholarly interest just now. Which was the real Luther? The distinction between the two Luthers

is an old one, as we have seen. Different ages have varied in their choices between the two. In general the liberal theologians and philosophers of the last period have preferred the younger Luther as the real Luther. Much attention has been attracted, therefore, by the remarkable position of the brilliant Ernst Troeltsch on this question. In his striking essay, itself a volume, on "Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit," which appears in "Die Kultur der Gegenwart" (Teil I, Abteilung IV, I. Hälfte, Ss. 253-458), as well as in other of his works, he sets forth with sharp acumen the view that the older Luther is the real Luther and that both Luther and his Reformation are thorough-going products of Catholicism and mediaevalism with scarcely any real significance for the modern world. Troeltsch places Erasmus and even Melancthon above Luther, and the really significant elements of the sixteenth century he sees in the Anabaptists and the radical movements. The modern period of history, according to Troeltsch, begins in the eighteenth century. This view is really a scholarly scientific version of Lang's view of half a century earlier. It has caused quite a stir among scholars. Some English and American scholars have already accepted the view as settled and assured. But in Germany many critical voices have been raised, first of all that of Loofs in his "Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit," and now the historical research has taken a new turn. The result will doubtless be a much clearer picture of the Humanists, the Counter-Reformation, and the radical movements of the sixteenth century.

Our sketch of Luther's career through these four centuries has indicated a line of movement that despite occasional retrogressions and reactions has been generally forward in its direction. First unreflective personal popularity, then an uninformed admiration for his individual words and deeds, then a pietistic or else a rationalistic conception of his fundamental motive coupled with mild criticism of certain features of his life and thought, then an effort to understand his personality by means of psychology, and finally in the nineteenth century an



application of all the improved instruments of science to every aspect of the man's personality and activity and influence. In the various nuances of Protestant Christianity today we still have some representatives of every one of the periods that have passed before our review of the four centuries. This is good for it and will help us to find and to keep the whole Luther. The newest problem concerns itself with Luther's relation and that of his Reformation to the origin of the modern world. It will be interesting to note just what turn the Quadricentennial Celebration of this year will give to the appraisalment of Luther.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE III.

MELANCHTHON AND THE LORD'S SUPPER  
AFTER HIS DIVERGENCE FROM LUTHER.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D.

Up to 1530 Melanchthon shared Luther's views entirely. Though at the Marburg Colloquy in 1529 he with Luther denied fellowship with the Zwinglians, yet that Colloquy made an impression on him he never got over. He was convinced that they were orthodox in everything else. He had found them milder than he had expected, and friendly. The more he thought the matter over the more sad he became because they had been rejected so peremptorily. While still not in favor of any union with them, that was on account of political fear lest the German princes would make themselves obnoxious to the emperor. For the latter hated the Swiss both on account of their love of freedom and of the radical and democratic tendencies of their Reformation.

But in the same year 1530 a book fell into the hands of Melanchthon which did not leave him untouched. It was a dialogue by Œcolampadius, the great Reformer of Basel, on the Supper in which he showed that the views of the Fathers need testing much more than Melanchthon had tested them. He showed that different views were in the ancient Church, which generally divided into two tendencies, the mystic and the symbolic. According to the mystic view there was a secret union of Christ or of the Logos with the bread and wine, but there was no defined doctrine as to this union. They only emphasized the practical element, the blessing of partaking. The doctrine of a change in the elements came out first since the 4th century. The symbolic view was that the elements were signs or figures, and this view was also in the Church Fathers. When Melanchthon read this book by Œcolampadius he wrote to Luther "Œcolampadius has written a dialogue against me, and as it seems to me more



carefully than he is usually accustomed to write. I shall bring it with me when God gets me out of here."<sup>1</sup> He wrote several things during the Reichstag of 1530 to make clear why he could not go with Zwingli, nor enter into Butzer's union proposals. He would not allow with Zwingli that Christ's body after the ascension was in a certain definite place, nor with Butzer that Christ was present in the Lord's Supper only to believers, saying on the other hand that although he was not specially in the bread he was really there.

In the beginning of 1531 Luther and Melanchthon heard of an important concession from the Reformed. Toward the end of 1530 Butzer by the Strassburg magistracy sent to the landgrave Philip of Hesse and to Duke Ernst of Lüneberg, both of whom were intensely interested in union between Luther and the Reformed, a compromise to the effect that Zwingli and Œcolampadius agreed with Luther that Christ's true body and true blood were in the Supper, and were reached and offered with the Word to the soul for food and for strengthening of faith. The landgrave communicated this to the Elector of Saxony and he to Luther. Luther heard this gladly, and said if he had their own assurances there might be a chance for union. At the same time Luther wrote to Butzer that he could scarcely believe that the Swiss would be ready to go so far. But there could be no union until they taught that the body of Christ was also received by the godless. Now neither in the Augsburg Confession nor in the Apology for that Confession, both drawn up by Melanchthon, was there any mention of the Real Presence to the godless. Butzer therefore could easily think that Luther and Melanchthon did not intend to insist on that aspect of the doctrine. And in fact they did give in so far as to write at the request of the Elector concerning the new proposal of Butzer. They said that if Butzer would really confess that Christ's body is truly with the signs, they would be satisfied and would suspend for the present a discussion over the partaking by the godless.<sup>2</sup> This

<sup>1</sup> Corp. Ref. 2. 217 (July 20, 1530).

<sup>2</sup> De Wette, Luther's Briefe 4. 325 (March 1531).

was a most important concession on Luther's side, as at the Marburg Colloquy this was a point of life and death with him. Was Melanchthon back of this concession? On January 22, 1531, Melanchthon wrote to Butzer. "I rejoice exceedingly that you acknowledge the presence of Christ as to his soul, and I cannot see why you should deny his presence as to the signs. Try to come to an understanding. If Luther were sure that he knew Zwingli's and Œcolampadius' view fully, that they really taught what you write,"<sup>3</sup> etc. But alas! Melanchthon's hopes for peace were in vain. Butzer had promised too much for the Swiss. But Melanchthon still kept up his correspondence with Butzer. In a letter of April 1531. he prays for union and says that this passionate strife between Luther and Butzer never pleased him, and he hopes it will cease.<sup>4</sup> Schmidt quotes a MS. letter of Melanchthon to Thomas Blaurer, in which he says that the idea of a bodily presence of Christ everywhere is more and more suspicious to him. He thinks, as Luther teaches, that Christ is in the bread as he is everywhere, that it is difficult to conceive that as bodily, as Christ is everywhere only according to his Godhead. He would not utter such thoughts against Luther, but proposed that Blaurer do so.<sup>5</sup> And he did, but whether Luther answered is not known. If this letter is genuine, and of this Schmidt has apparently no doubt, it shows a remarkable coming down from the Luther view.

In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Melanchthon says that "in the Supper Christ offers to us his body and blood to witness to us that he has gone hence for us, so that we can have forgiveness of sins through him." But of the way he is present he says nothing. In the Latin edition of the Augsburg Confession (1531) he omitted the words "under form of bread and wine." This does not mean he shared Zwingli's view of a remembrance

3 Cor. Ref. 2. 470.

4 Cor. Ref. 2. 498.

5 Schmidt, Melanchthon, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 315. In spite of the admirable smaller Lives by Richard, New York, 1898, and Ellinger, Berlin 1902, this massive and thorough study by the Strassburg Professor remains indispensable to all students of the Preceptor of Germany.



Supper, which he constantly rejected (1) as too much opposed to literal words of institution, (2) as giving too much play to the reason, and (3) as exciting doubt instead of certainty. "Why circulate profane speculations," he writes to Rothmann, preacher at Münster, "whether Christ is nowhere except in heaven, and sits at definite place. The Scripture orders us to call upon him. We must confess that he is truly with the Word and sign, and that he has promised to be with us and to console us. I know well that acute spirits brood over this, and that learned people indorse Zwingli's doctrine, for which they have apparent grounds. But that is not everything. The Presence, as I state it, has for it the analogy of faith."<sup>6</sup>

It is clear to me that Melanchthon was getting nearer the Reformed doctrine of the Supper, without leaving the substance of the Lutheran. He believed in the Real Presence of the body and blood in the Supper, but only in a heavenly and divine manner, and he was most anxious for a union with the South. When Butzer sent him his book on the preparation for a Council he wrote him:

I shall write you later about your book. I only wish now to say how truly and heartily I love you. You are trying with right diligence what is necessary for a union of the Churches, and I promise to stand by you on this with my best powers. For I am not at all pleased that there should be a split over one doctrine. I do hope that means will be found to make an end of the division. That sudden coming together (at Marburg Colloquy) of men who are determined not to give in can not help out so great an evil. Would to God that you and I at least could have a conference on this doctrine.<sup>7</sup> (This very thing soon happened).

That is the word of a man who sees no irreconcilable difficulty in the Supper doctrine of himself and the Reformed.

What Melanchthon wanted was the definite assurance that as a pledge of his love and redemption the body and

<sup>6</sup> Dec. 24, 1532, in Cor. Ref. 2, 620.

<sup>7</sup> Oct. 10, 1533. Corp. Ref. 2, 675.

blood of Christ in which that redemption was won were really present in the Eucharist and given to believers. So far he agreed with Luther and with all High Catholic Churchmen. The essential Presence was fundamental with Melanchthon.<sup>8</sup> But it was a presence mediated by Christ's Divinity, and so spiritual and divine, not bodily in the sense of Luther. Melanchthon was seeking a *Via Media* between Luther's realism and Butzer's spiritualism, which would preserve the truth of both views, and be a bond of union to both parties. Luther on the other hand would have no middle way. The Swiss, Luther says, see in the Supper only a sign, while "the sum of our opinion is that in and with the bread the body of Christ works and suffers, that he is distributed, eaten and bitten with the teeth. From this opinion I cannot deviate even if the world should tumble around me."<sup>9</sup>

Melanchthon and Butzer did come together with the landgrave of Hesse at Cassel December 1534. There Luther's formula about the true body being bitten with the teeth was placed before Butzer. The latter replied he could not at all agree to that. There was nothing about that in the Augsburg Confession, and it was only in accordance with that Confession which he and his friends could teach. Luther's putting was only a private opinion. Butzer assured Melanchthon that he and the preachers of the upper Rhine country confessed that the body of Christ is essentially and truly received, that bread and wine are signs with which at the same time body and blood are given and partaken, that bread and body are not connected with each other by a mixing of their nature, but by a sacramental union. This notable confession was brought back to Luther, and even Luther said that for the sake of peace he might be reconciled with it for the time being, only there was no hurry. Then Melanchthon and Luther sent it to the other Lutheran theologians to get their views, and Melanchthon wrote them at the same time whether for peace's sake that view could not be tolerated, as in essence it is not different

8 See letter in Latin in *ib.* 2, 800, in German in Schmidt, 318-9.

9 De Wette 4, 569. Dec. 16, 1534.



from ours. At the bottom the only question is about physical union of bread and body. But why do we want that? One can treat the sacrament rightly without touching that.<sup>10</sup> Most of the theologians answered in a friendly way.

There were two things which dominated Melanchthon at this time (1535 ff). First, adherence to the general teaching of the Church Catholic. "I will not be a starter or defender of any new dogma," he wrote to Brentz.<sup>11</sup> He was devoted to the truth, and in his mind the truth lay in the general consensus of the Church, not in any extreme doctrine on one side or the other, not in the too literal application of Luther nor in the too figurative of Zwingli. Second, striving after unity of action, view, aim with all Christians,—Reformed on the one hand, liberal Catholic on the other. He made another study of the Fathers, and this brought him to the conclusion that he had been mistaken somewhat as to their view. "I see," he wrote to Brentz, "that there are many expressions of the old writers which clearly explain the sacrament typically or tropically. The contrary passages are either new or opinions. Investigate the matter yourself to see whether you defend the doctrine of the ancients. I heartily wish the Church might decide the matter without sophistry or tyranny." From now on, says Schmidt, he held the view that the spiritual communion of Christ and inner communion with him was the alone essential thing in the Supper, and that outside of the moment of the use of the elements the name sacrament was not deserved.<sup>12</sup>

I have said before (Melanchthon writes in the 1535 edition of *Loci*) that the word sacrament means an external sign which God has joined to his promise, through which he offers grace. So this external sign (bread) is a sacrament, for one should understand and take it for an external divine pledge and seal of the whole Gospel. . . . And so this external sign is to

<sup>10</sup> Cor. Ref. 2. 826f.

<sup>11</sup> Ib. 2. 824.

<sup>12</sup> Schmidt, 321.

be received, when we believe the divine promise that we are offered through Christ consolation and the forgiveness of sins. And that external sign God places before our bodily eyes, and lets us here eat, drink and partake, so that we may be awakened in faith and become the more certain and strong in the knowledge of Christ. For when Christ gives us his body, he takes us as members of himself, and shows very comfortably that grace and treasure are for us. For how could God come nearer to us with grace and blessing than when Christ gives us his body and we become his members?.... But when we enjoy all this in the Lord's Supper, the faith in the divine promise must be there, and thus receive through the external signs and the Word consolation and quickening.... There is passionate division and strife over this sacrament. Some dispute whether the word of Christ, This is my body, is a metaphor. How the old teachers understood the word one can see out of their writings. Paul says that the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ, the cup which we drink is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? Therefore when one offers in the Supper bread and wine, there is truly offered to us the body and blood of Christ, and Christ is truly there, and is powerful in us, as Hilarius says: This eating and drinking makes it that Christ is in us and we in him. And it is truly a wonderfully dear great pledge of the highest divine love toward us and the highest mercy, that the Lord in the Supper shows that he truly gives himself to us, that he truly gives us to enjoy his body and blood, that he makes us members of himself, upon which we know that he loves us, takes us up, protects and upholds us.

Now this is a beautiful statement of a high doctrine of the sacrament as a precious spiritual possession, through which in the partaking of the signs, by faith we receive the body and blood, and thus by this challenge to our faith in partaking are built up in Christ. The Reformed



could assent to this, as well as the Lutheran. Even a Methodist—at least a High one—could say Amen to it all. Nothing is said as to how the body is related to the bread, but the spiritual blessing is strongly emphasized. In a letter to his friend Veit Deitrich at Nürnberg he says:

In order not to separate myself too far from the ancients, I set the sacramental Presence in the use [not simply in the signs], and say that with the offered bread and wine Christ is truly present and effective. That is certainly enough. I add nothing as to an inclusion or union, according to which the body attaches to the bread or is mixed with it. What more do you want? One must be content with this, unless you want to assert that body and blood are given separately: this is new, and would not even please the Papists. The physical union raises many questions. Are the parts separate? Are they in bread and wine outside of use? One reads nothing of this in ancients. I will not bring in these disputations in the Church. Therefore I have spoken little of them in the *Loci* so as to turn aside the youth from these questions.<sup>13</sup>

In order to bring a closer union between the Reformed and Lutheran, a friendly conference was arranged at Wittenberg, where Butzer and Capito (one of the preachers in Strassburg) talked over matters with Luther and Melanchthon, though there were others present. Luther was not well at this time, and the discussion took place in his house, May 1536. Melanchthon drew up a formula for both parties, and both signed it,—the so-called Wittenberg Concord.

1. We confess according to the words of Irenaeus that the Supper consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly. Therefore they (Butzer and his friends) believe and teach that with bread and wine Christ's body and blood are truly and essentially present, given and partaken of. 2. Though they hold that neither transubstantiation, nor local inclusion in the bread, nor any permanent union outside

<sup>13</sup> Corp. Ref. 3. 514 April 23, 1538.

of use, takes place, yet they concede that by virtue of sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ; that means, they believe that with the reached bread the body of Christ is at the same time present and truly given. Outside of use, as when the bread is in the monstrance, or carried around in procession, as Papists do, they do not believe that Christ's body is present. 3. They believe that the sacrament in the Church is powerful, and independent of the worthiness of the priest or of those partaking. So as Paul says that even the unworthy partake of the body of Christ,<sup>14</sup> so they [Butzer, etc.] believe that there is given truly the same body and blood, and that they receive them, as where the words and sense are to be preserved. The unworthy partake, however, to judgment, as they misuse the sacrament, because they take it without penitence and faith. It is therefore instituted that those who are penitent and console themselves in Christ through faith, are partakers of the beneficence of Christ and as his members are cleansed by his blood.<sup>15</sup>

Written under the immediate eye of Luther this strong statement is rather notable for what it does not say, and it is evident that Luther tried to be moderate and yielding to the best of his ability. A High Church sacramental Methodist or Presbyterian could confess his faith in those words, though a Low Churchman would want to make some distinctions. But if there is only a sacramental union, one may interpret that union to suit the truth as he conceives it. Melancthon did not hold it was a union of substance, much less of physical interpenetration. Was it then a union of reference, of type, of religious value, or what? The body of Jesus went with it, so to speak. But what is the body of Jesus? And since it can

14 What Paul says is that "whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat." You will notice that Paul does not say that the unworthy partake of the body, but that the believer partakes of the bread and by faith discerns the body. The unbeliever does not discriminate the body. See 1 Cor. 11:27, 28.

15 Cor. Ref. 3. 75.



be received for salvation only by faith, is it anything else than the blessings which Jesus procured for us in and through that body?

Anyhow the fire-eating Lutherans did not like the Wittenberg Concord, partly because the Reformed signed it. Their not liking it filled Melanchthon with pain. He saw that union with the Roman Catholics was impossible, and felt all the more anxious to bring all who believed the Gospel together. And in this Luther met him with a willingness more than we could expect. So it grieved Melanchthon that some Lutherans spoke of the Churches of the Upper Rhine almost as they did of the Turks. He kept up his studies of the Fathers on the Supper and other matters. "Since for more than 10 years no day and no night has gone by without my thinking over the Supper" (3, 537). This study in Church History convinced him even more strongly that many of the Fathers had a symbolic interpretation of the Words of Institution. He held himself to such passages as 1 Cor. 10, 16, Eph. 5, 30, which seemed to protect the secret of the sacrament against every exaggerated or rationalistic view. The spiritual effect of Christ in the sacrament, the sacramental union, the presence of body and blood *with* bread and wine, the synecdoche, he held as sufficient to preserve the honor and deep sense of the Supper. Therefore in the 1540 edition of the Augsburg Confession he omitted the words, "The contrary doctrine is rejected," and instead of saying, "The body and blood are distributed," he said, "The body and blood are set forth." It has been claimed by my late learned and lamented friend, Professor Dr. James W. Richard, that this meant no change of view of Melanchthon, nor any deviation from Luther. It meant no change of view since 1535, but it certainly meant a change since 1520, and Luther's disposition to put no sprag in the wheel of Melanchthon's irenic advances is much to his credit. The new expressions of Melanchthon presuppose faith in those receiving and were consistent with spiritual reception, while not denying Luther's realistic view. Schmidt says (p. 423-4) that without doubt he made these changes to meet Calvin, with

whom he had talked in Frankfurt in 1539 on the Supper, and in such a way that led Calvin to say that they agreed.

Another evidence of the change in Melanchthon is his new attitude toward the elevation of the host. As a protest against what he thought Carlstadt's depreciation of the Supper, Luther kept up the elevation. Later he kept it up on account of the weak, though holding it not essential, only one of the adiaphora. At the Wittenberg Concord in 1536 Butzer had called Luther's attention to this practice as one done away in Hesse and other German Churches. A strife broke out in Nürnberg over the practice, where one of the preachers wanted it stopped. Dietrich and Osiander wrote to Melanchthon about it, and Melanchthon consulted Luther. The latter burst out, Such things are unimportant. Why should they quarrel about them? But, said Melanchthon, not so. If you believe in the real presence of the body, you must have the elevation, if not, if there is no local presence of the body in the bread, then you ought to omit the elevation. Dietrich had a high view of the Presence, and Melanchthon wrote to him.

The sacraments are signs that with the given things something else is present. Adoration is not necessary, or if you keep it up it should not be made to the bread. Hypostatic union is not the word. Even Catholics don't use that. There is a real union, as that between fire and iron. I believe in a real union, but no inclusive one, but a sacramental, which means that with the given signs Christ is truly effective.<sup>16</sup>

Later Melanchthon prevailed upon Luther to give up the elevation, another sign of Luther's reasonableness, and from this time (1543) it disappeared from Protestant worship.

If Luther showed these welcome signs of moderation, he nevertheless soon came out with a fierce book against the Zwinglians. A book or tract had appeared in Köln, the *Kölner Reformation*, said to be by Butzer and Me-

<sup>16</sup> Cor. Ref. 3. 514. Ap. 29, 1538.



lanchthon, of a quite spiritual tenor with regard to the Supper. The archbishop of Köln handed it to the elector of Saxony Johann Friedrich, who did not like it, and who sent it to Amsdorf, bishop of Naumburg, for his judgment. Amsdorf sent the book to Wittenberg with a very unfavorable judgment. This strengthened Luther against the book, and he sent it to Brück, chancellor to the Elector of Saxony, with a letter in which he said that Amsdorf's article pleased him well. He (Luther) then read the book itself and there was nothing in what it said on sacrament that pleased him. There is much talk, said Luther, about the usefulness, fruit, and honor of the sacrament, but as to the substance it mumbles, and one does not know how to take it, just like the fanatics (apparently here Zwinglians), against whom it does not say a word. You cannot tell from it whether one receives with the mouth the true body and blood of Jesus or not, nor anything against the fanatics (Zwinglians) who have worse articles than the Anabaptists. The book is not only tolerable to the fanatics, but even comforting, rather for their doctrine than for ours. I am very much displeased. And the book is so long-winded that I trace well the prattler Bucer.<sup>17</sup>

In private conversations and in lectures and sermons Luther spoke out his dissatisfaction on the new turn things had taken with regard to the Supper, prepared a new book, and looked through his old books to see about the translation of one or more of them into Latin for circulation in France and Italy. All this put poor Melancthon into an agony of fear. "If this new strife breaks out," said he "it will cause much worse and more tragic confusion than anything hitherto. I am sorry that this tragedy should begin again, more for the sake of public matters than for my own. I don't know what will happen to me. Perhaps I shall have to wander forth in this my (old) age. Is there anything more sorrowful, more deserving of tears than that this holy pledge of love should be used as a subject of strife and division."<sup>18</sup> They

<sup>17</sup> De Wette, 5. 708-9.

<sup>18</sup> Cor. Ref. 5. 461, 464. Aug. 11, 12, 1544.

told Melanchthon that Luther had a book ready in which he was to attack him and Butzer, and was going to set out a formula which they must either subscribe or not be tolerated. "Luther has never driven this matter with more mighty zeal," said Melanchthon. "I give up all hope to see peace kept up between our Churches. Our opponents lift up their heads, and we tear ourselves. This makes me unending pain. As for myself I am quiet, and if he (Luther) presses me too much I shall gladly flee out of this prison."<sup>19</sup> Melanchthon's brother George urged him not to get into a controversy with Luther, but to leave Wittenberg.

But things were not quite so bad. Their fears were more or less groundless. Köstlin says it was not Luther's way to come out suddenly and unexpectedly against friends. However excited and angry he might have been at that time, if he intended to attack Melanchthon publicly, he would not have done it without previously opening his heart to him.<sup>20</sup> Luther indeed came out with his book *Kurzes Bekenntniss vom heiligen Sacrament, wider die Schwärmer*, end of September 1544, but it did not mention Melanchthon nor even Butzer. Luther was near the end of his life (d. Feb. 1546). He was ill, irritable and passionate, and he so wrote.

"Before I go to my grave, I want to bring with me this witness and this fame before the judgment seat of my Lord that I with all earnestness have condemned and avoided according to his command in Tit. 3:10 the fanatics and enemies of the sacrament, Carlstadt, Zwingli, Œcolampadius, Stenkefeld (Schwenkfeld), and their disciples in Zurich and wherever they are." He will make firm against the fanatics that in Rom. 4:21 what God speaks he can perform. He asks how one can believe in the humanity and divinity of Christ in one person or of the incarnation of the Saviour, and yet not believe in the article of the Supper. For it is either you believe or you don't believe. Since the fanatics carry on a

<sup>19</sup> To Butzer: ib. 5. 474.

<sup>20</sup> Martin Luther, 5 Aufl. v. Kawerau II. 583.



great twaddle about spiritual eating and drinking, and of the unity of Christians at the Supper,— this is only idle figleaves with which they would cover their sins. Since they have blamed the orthodox as 'flesh eaters' and thrown out blasphemies concerning a 'bread God,' I know the right name for them, namely, that they are soul-murderers and have an indeviled, throughdeviled, overdeviled, blasphemous heart and lying mouth. Let no one pray for those who sin unto death (1 Jno. 5:16). I will except the poor people and the weak, who allow themselves to be instructed. I speak of the masters. They are high and often warned. He who does not want to remain, let him go. Though at Marburg I agreed with several doctrines of Zwingli, yet in his posthumous book *Auseinandersetzung des Glaubens* Zwingli allows to be saved Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Numa, etc. Therefore he treated (at Marburg) everything with a false heart, and has become himself a heathen. I will not refute my opponents again in this book."<sup>21</sup>

Kolde says that in spite of its sharpness this Bekenntniss was relatively mild, and even more than in earlier writings he shows that what led him to such determined judgment of his opponents was not pleasure in scholastic hair-splitting, nor even a theological, but almost entirely a religious, interest.<sup>22</sup> It is only fair to Luther to add that he kept quiet as to any suspicions against Butzer and Melanchthon, especially the latter, and wanted to keep silence, unless they themselves gave strong and open signs of it. He kept from all questions and inquiries which would in any way bring out ill-feeling between himself and Melanchthon. Cruciger wrote to Dietrich Oct. 5, 1544, that although at the beginning they took it for granted that Luther had suspicion or ill-feeling against Butzer and Melanchthon, they had since noticed nothing of the kind. A month later Brück wrote to the elector: "I notice of Philip nothing else than that he and

<sup>21</sup> Erl. Ausg. 32. 39ff.

<sup>22</sup> Kolde, Martin Luther. ii. 545 (Gotha 1893).

Martin are quite good friends. The Almighty send his grace." At his next birthday, Nov. 10, 1544, Luther invited to dinner Melanchthon, Cruciger, Bugenhagen, Jonas and Major, where they talked together in love over the Church and the dangers of the present.<sup>23</sup>

It seems that Melanchthon had one more conversation with Luther on the Lord's Supper, in which he assured him that he still taught the synechdoche, that he believed that Christ was truly present with the bread and wine and made us his members, and that he hoped Luther would be satisfied with this. After that the subject was avoided.

Melanchthon hoped that no answer would be written to Luther's book, but the Zürichers wrote a sharp reply to it by the pen of Bullinger. Even Calvin did not like the way Bullinger handled Luther.

"I wish you would keep in memory what kind of a man Luther is, the high gifts he possesses, with what bravery and perseverance, with what power and skill of doctrine he has hitherto fought the kingdom of Antichrist and propagated the Gospel of salvation. Even if he should call me a devil, still I would always show him honor, hold him for an elect servant of God, who has, of course, beside glorious virtues his weaknesses. Think that you have to do with a disciple of Christ whom we all have to thank."<sup>24</sup>

Calvin did not care much for Bullinger's book, which he thought weak. He wrote to Melanchthon: "We are all indebted to greatest thanks to Luther. It pleases me that he has the highest honor, if he would only be more moderate. Good God! What joy we give the papists, and what a sorry example we are leaving to posterity!"<sup>25</sup> This was Melanchthon's feeling also in what Schmidt calls this most unhappy of all controversies.

You all know the passion and moral weakness in one matter of the landgrave Philip of Hesse, but on this threatened split between Melanchthon and Luther, the

<sup>23</sup> Köstlin, *ib.* ii. 583-4.

<sup>24</sup> Nov. 25, 1544. Quoted by Schmidt, p. 430.

<sup>25</sup> June 28, 1545. Quoted by *ib.*, p. 430.



news of which spread through Germany causing fearful consternation among Protestants, he wrote more sensible words, and showed more concern for the Reformation, than many better men. He wrote to Chancellor Brück:

For the honor of Christ ponder this matter truly and with all diligence. Luther as well as the Zürichers are somewhat rough (in this controversy), but there is no need of their getting heated and making others suffer, but should act as more reasonable men and exercise a Christian patience. For should disunion once grow between Luther and Master Philip, —God help us! What would come out of it! How the Papists would glory and say, If a kingdom is divided in itself it will go down. It would also without doubt cause many Christian people to become offended and scandalized and many fall away from the Gospel. Oh Almighty God, what is the matter with people that they get up such hurtful and angry disputes. It is not a true apostolic spirit that does that, but such a spirit as seeks quarrel, division and brawl.<sup>26</sup>

It was reported that Luther intended to publish an answer to Bullinger's book. The landgrave urged the elector to prevent it if possible, as the only people who profit by this strife are the Catholics. John Frederick then sent his chancellor Brück to Melanchthon, who said to Brück with tears that the Zürichers were a coarse and unquiet people, that if Luther got into this thing again his displeasure would mislead him beyond the Wittenberg Concord, and there would be a still worse division, and suggested that the elector suppress the controversy in Saxony and forbid the sale of Bullinger's book. When Melanchthon thus appealed to spoke to Luther, the latter promised not to write a book, but only some simple articles to be laid for subscription before the evangelical Bund. But Luther was too near the end. Even that much he never did. Calvin urged Melanchthon himself to write on the Supper, an interesting indication of how much in common there was in the minds of these theolo-

gians, what a large common spiritual residuum there was at the bottom of the Reformed and Lutheran doctrines of the Supper. "I assert a hundred times," said Calvin in his last answer to Westphal, "that it is not possible for this cause (of the Supper) to tear Philip from me than from his own viscera." But of course it was no time for that. Melanchthon and Luther still continued as they had been for 30 years. In March 1545 he wrote a preface to the first volume of a new edition of Luther's Latin Works, in which he set him forth as a witness for the truth raised and illuminated by God. In the same volume Luther said of Melanchthon,—and in spite of the earnestness and even narrowness of Luther's theological conscience, it speaks volumes for him that though thoroughly familiar with Melanchthon's widening gaze during the last decade or two, he could yet say of him (in his own preface), after depreciating his own books, "that there were many text-books now for religious readers, especially Melanchthon's *Loci*, in which a theologian and clergyman could excellently educate themselves. What God has accomplished through this instrument, not only in sciences, but in theology, is witnessed by his Works, how angry soever Satan and his following may be over them." I think I have not quoted before the words of Luther taken down by Mathesius.

He who desires to become a theologian has the Bible; after that let him read the *Loci* of Philip, that is, get them in his head. When he has both, he is a theologian; to him all theology stands open. You can find no other book under the sun, where the whole theology is so finely ordered as in the *Loci*. Philip is more moderate than I, he defends and teaches; I am a talker, more a public speaker (rhetoric). If people will follow me, they must only print those of my books which teach doctrine, such as (the Commentaries on) Galatians, Deuteronomy, John. Let the other books be only for history, so that one can see how it began, for at first it was not so easy as now.<sup>27</sup>

27 Quoted by Köstlin ii. 594.



Besides his own bodily troubles, Luther was too much distressed by matters nearer home to write further on the Supper. There was too much moral disorder among students and citizens of Wittenberg. Perhaps to help this the law faculty of the University put forth a resolution which declared valid a secret marriage, concluded without consent of parents. This greatly embittered Luther, who preached mightily against "this upsetting of the divine law." Luther was so displeased over the jurists and over the general conditions in Wittenberg that he left the city and withdrew to Merseberg with George of Anhalt. Melanchthon was much troubled, and asked the elector to call him back. He himself went after him, and brought him back appeased. So he labored to be in all things a peacemaker. When somebody became offended at Luther he made peace, so that Cruciger (Professor in Wittenberg) could write to Veit Deitrich: "If Philip were not here, who keeps unity among us by his moderation and benevolence, the University would fall to pieces."<sup>28</sup>

In 1552 ff. a strife broke out again on the Supper led by Pastor Westphal of Hamburg, who proclaimed Luther's doctrine in an extreme form. Although Luther believed in the ubiquity of Christ's body, that doctrine was not taken up in the Protestant confessions. Westphal and Timann of Bremen came out with a strong statement of it. Although Luther said once that the body of Christ was bitten with the teeth, this was not his usual expression. The mouth takes the bread, but faith alone takes the body and with it forgiveness of sins. That was Luther's usual way of speaking. But these zealous followers took an occasional extravagance literally, and built on it a far reaching premise which damned the Reformed and even Melanchthon, who called this new emphasis, bread-idolatry. Hardenberg, a preacher in the Cathedral in Bremen, opposed this extreme Luther doctrine, and he was at length driven out. Some councillors at Bremen asked the advice of the Wittenberg theologians, who contented themselves with warning Bremen against

<sup>28</sup> Corp. Ref. 5. 314. Feb. 15, 1544. Schmidt, 433.

untenable formulae and strange disputations, and keeping themselves to the Augsburg Confession. Both parties, and especially Calvin, tried to get Melanchthon to come out fully on the matter, but he declined. He never wrote another book on the Supper. From 1535 to the end of his troubled life he held steadfastly to a middle way between a High Lutheran and a Low Reformed view, viz., that the sacrament is a sacrament only in the moment of use, that the body and blood of Christ are really present to faith and are by it received as a pledge of our implanting in Him, that Christ is therefore really present in the sacrament, and by it is effective in us. But this is a secret mystery of grace, and is not physical. There is no material presence, or local inclusion, of the body. Christ is received with the bread, but only by the believer and by faith. Melanchthon gave up belief in a reception by the unbeliever. With Luther he sees in the Supper a guarantee of the possession of justifying grace. The Presence is not less real and substantial for being spiritual. What it was more particularly, Melanchthon avoided saying, emphasizing rather the practical religious significance of the Supper, and desiring to leave room for varying views so long as an objective Presence was held.

*Drew Theological Seminary,  
Madison, N. J.*



## ARTICLE IV.

## CAESAR AND HIS SOLDIERS.

## A Study in Wages.

BY T. B. STORK.

Veni, vidi, vici! Caesar's proud words of conquest were couched in the first person singular; he did not say "we" or "you," but with proud, if unconscious, arrogance, "I have conquered." It was not the Roman Republic, not even the army, but he, Julius Caesar, who had done the deed. Suppose one of his legionaries, say of the favorite Tenth, had asked, in popular slang: "Where do I come in; have I no share in this deed? You, for this work, will receive the undisputed empire of the known world. Am I to have only my pay, my allotment of land, for doing that which has earned you the world?" So we may suppose the argument to have run, raising thus in those early times the puzzling problem of how the result of man's labors, that is, wealth, is to be divided when produced by the co-operative labor of many workers in some common undertaking: for it is just here that the whole crux of modern economic problems centers—the unequal distribution of wealth, the relation of capital and labor—the rate of wages; in other words, all these are questions arising out of what may be called the personal equation, the individual ability of each man to do and to get. Caesar gets the world because he earns it, just as his legionary gets his stipend, and for exactly the same reason, and the relation of Caesar and his legionaries affords a striking, picturesque, yet perfectly just, illustration of the whole question; for the relation of labor and capital is always that of a vast army of workmen who, with the tools furnished and under the directions given by some industrial captain, or Caesar, go forth to conquer nature, to take from her useful and valuable things. What is to be done with these useful and valuable things after they are gotten, how they are to be divided in accordance with justice,

depends upon a proper statement of the relations of Caesar to his army, upon the question of how much his army has contributed to the joint product of their labors.

It is the contention of many economists that the laborer gets too small a share of the total product. One of the most popular of recent economists, Mr. Scott Nearing, thus voices the general opinion: "Always the thought is there in its most general form, carrying with it the possibility of revolt against any economic order which denies to a man the right to his full earnings."<sup>1</sup> Which means, I suppose, if it means anything, to assert that under present conditions the laboring man does not receive his full earnings. The dominating idea in the discussion seems to be that, since the product of modern industry, the accumulation of wealth by it, is so much greater than by the older and simpler methods, therefore, the laboring man should receive for his labor a share proportionate to the greater product, and that, without regard to how the increase in product has been brought about; whether, that is, the laborer has produced it or whether it owes its existence to other factors in the process of production.

Thus again, quoting the same economist, the complaint of the laborer is voiced to the effect that "Each year enormous payments are being made to the owners of property in the United States in return for their bare ownership; at the same time the workers whose efforts are responsible for bringing these values into being receive, in many cases, returns which sound like mere pittance."<sup>2</sup>

It must be conceded that the wealth produced by modern industry far exceeds the amount produced in the past and that of this wealth some classes of the community receive a very much larger share than others; whether justly or unjustly cannot, however, be decided off-hand on a mere comparison of the several amounts so paid. That every man should receive the full earnings of his labor may be conceded, but how are these full earnings to be measured? What is the just rule for dividing the results produced by some vast undertaking of modern industry?

<sup>1</sup> Work and Pay, page 49.

<sup>2</sup> Work and Pay, page 41.



This is the problem set before us and it is not to be decided in the off-hand, obvious way that some economists would have us think. The mere fact that men who are separately laboring each by himself could only produce say  $x$  valuable products, and that when laboring together in some great combination, and with the help of machinery, they produce, say  $x$  plus  $y$  products, goes not one step toward establishing the proposition that they should receive each a larger share of the product than before. It is true that there is a larger product to divide, but it does not follow that the individual laborer ought, of right to receive any greater share of it. We must first establish some principle or rule by which to measure justly the amount due to each laborer in return for his labor. What then is the just measure of wages, is the question we have first to answer. Fortunately there are certain well recognized principles by which we may guide our inquiry. One of these is that no laborer is entitled to receive one iota more than the product of his labor; this is so obvious that it seems scarcely worthy of a formal statement. Nature, which is the final paymaster of wages, pays in this way and only in this way. In uncombined labor, where a single man labors and receives the product of his labor directly, the matter is plain enough; he takes what he gets and must perforce get that and only that which is rendered back to him in answer to his exertion; the fisherman gets his catch of fish, the farmer takes his crop, and there is an end; if they get little or nothing, there is no question of justice or injustice, it is merely niggard nature that has failed to reward their labor, and in the most complicated and elaborate operations of modern industry, however, apparently different, the rule is practically the same.

Nature is the paymaster in the last resort of one as much as of the other, and so we can easily see that the just wages of the laborer is what his labor has produced, no more, no less. It may be more difficult to ascertain what this product is in the latter case; great and complicated operations involve so many elements that what share, say of a railroad or a steamship or a canal, any one

laborer produces may be very difficult to measure. But mere difficulty in applying the principle is no reason for impeaching its validity. Whether it be railroad, steamship, canal or what you will of joint product, the laborer is entitled and only entitled to that share of the final product which his labor has produced; that is the law of his labor by himself and there is no change wrought by the mere combination of many laborers together in a joint effort, however complicated and extensive. If we would know therefore, the just amount of product or wages that are due to each laborer in a complicated undertaking, we must ask what each has contributed to the final result. And the very first point that meets us on the threshold of our inquiry is this: that the laborer contributes no more exertion, exercises no more intelligence, but often less, than when laboring alone; he runs, as we shall notice hereafter, less risk; he is subjected to less hardship in many cases; on what ground, therefore, shall we attribute to him any more efficiency in producing the final product; why should we credit him with any increase of the amount of the product?

What then is the factor responsible for the great increase in the product of these combinations of men and material? The answer is in one word, Caesar. It is because theorists, labor agitators, political economists have neglected this, the crucial point of the whole matter, that many of the difficulties of great wealth, meager wages, disparity of the conditions of rich and poor and the discontent naturally resulting therefrom have arisen.

It is the exercise of their powers of leadership, of command, of executive capacity, foresight, judgment, whatever you choose to call that transcendent and rare power possessed by some men to manage and handle great enterprises, to carry to a successful conclusion some difficult and vast undertaking that gives Caesar and his like their great share of the results they produce. Without them and the vast undertakings they make possible, no surplus value, no wealth properly so called, would ever come into existence. This is no fanciful idea, no imaginative theory, but the cold, hard reality that we meet every day in the



world. The wages of Caesar, his share of the results of these great undertakings, is his because he earns it. It is Caesar and his like who make the difference between success and failure. Caesar's soldiers were not better than Pompey's at Pharsalia (they were less than half in number); they were no braver, no stronger or more clever, yet they won the victory. What was the deciding factor, what gave to them victory, and to their opponents defeat? There is but one answer, it was Caesar. French workmen are not inferior in strength or intelligence to the American, yet they failed to build the Panama Canal, which was completed by the Americans under Goethals. It will hardly be contended that the deciding element, the factor that made the undertaking successful was the change of workmen; it was Goethals who did the work, with no better men nor any greater strength of muscle. Or, changing the point of view a trifle, let us see what happens in Caesar's absence. What ails desolated, war-torn Mexico today, and what has been happening there for the last two or three years, but the search for a Caesar, for some man who can bring order out of chaos. How much did the presence of Diaz, the alleged wicked, unscrupulous Caesar of that country, add to its material wealth, to the comfort and commonplace happiness of every man, woman and child, who could under him, at least enjoy the great boon of security of life and property! How many lives and how much material wealth have been lost by the absence of his hand from the helm of power!

The continuous anarchy, misery, starvation of men and destruction of property show how rare is the efficient and real Caesar who has the capacity and ability to handle great undertakings, governmental or industrial. What would not the Mexicans pay for another Diaz? What would not even the day laborers pay out of their wages for the security and the opportunity of laboring which another Diaz might afford? Or again, what would have been the worth to Great Britain of a Caesar at the Dardanelles? How many thousands of valuable lives, sacrificed for no purpose, might have been saved! How much

suffering and misery of a prolonged and wearing war might have been avoided; how much actual wealth have been saved! How many army corps would Germany consider equivalent for a Mackensen or a Von Hindenburg?

We realize in these striking instances what Caesar means in some of his more conspicuous functions, but we must remember that in modern industrial organization in a comparatively smaller degree, and gradually growing smaller as we descend the industrial scale to lesser enterprises, the same rule holds good. Caesar plays his part and earns his reward as truly. What then is the measure of such a man's wages? Must it not be the efficiency he shows in producing results, and is he not justly paid a generous share of the product which he himself produces? It is on this that the whole problem of wealth, poverty, living wage, turns. Unless you deny to Caesar his right to exercise unrestrained save by the old legal maxim *sic utere tuo*, the gifts which nature has given him it is hard to see how you can deny his right to the wages earned by these gifts. If anything is his, surely the natural powers and ability of a man are his, and if they are to have any value surely there follows the right to exercise them.

In earlier times with primitive conditions of production, when each man labored by himself and there were no great combinations of men and means, there was no place for Caesar; no opportunity for the exercise of his powers. Nor on the other hand were any great gains of material wealth made. Such conditions made no demand for Caesars; their exceptional powers were unknown and uncalled for. Just as in primitive warfare, in the combat of brute with brute, there was no call for a Julius Caesar or an Alexander of Macedon. In single combat with Goliath, Julius Caesar would probably have little or no advantage over the ordinary soldier; his surpassing ability as a great commander would there have no room for display; in a rough give and take of blows, it would have no effective part. But once put in his hands a Roman Legion with its thousands of men, and his great gifts, the like of which have only once or twice in the history of the



world appeared in the person of a single man, would find their legitimate sphere of action.

So in the world of industry, Andrew Carnegie, Rothschild, Rockefeller, Goethals, Shonts, Hill, Huntingdon, Harriman, Herr Balin, whomsoever you please to name of the organizers and captains of modern industry, would probably accomplish little more than any other able-bodied laborer in those primitive occupations of fishing, hunting, or cultivating the soil with spade or shovel, which were the original labors of our Adams and Eves, but in modern highly organized and vastly capitalized industries, these men find their opportunity and their necessity. They are as essential as Caesar to his army; without them modern industry could not exist.

Here then we find the cause of the greatly increased wealth of modern times: first, in the combination of labor and capital in large undertakings, and second, in the management of these industrial Caesars who are essential factors; so essential indeed that without them such undertakings would be impossible.

Side by side and coincident with these combinations there has occurred a very significant change in the use and management of private property by its owners, a revolution so gradual and natural that it has escaped special observation. Even as late as one hundred years ago the owner of private property, the investor who wished to get an income from his acquisitions, bought land or houses, or if he wished a less substantial, more liquid form of investment, he had recourse to ground rents, mortgages, loans to individuals or to the State, and there his list of investments perforce ended; there was little else. In all these, save perhaps the loans to the Government, he was perfectly alone in his conduct of his affairs; he was his own captain of industry, watched his lands, cared for his houses and his loans. Now all this is changed. The modern capitalist, for the most part, puts his money with easy confidence in stocks and bonds of innumerable corporations varied and different as the various tastes of the individual investor. Whether this change in the management of



private property is a cause or a result of the contemporaneous change in industrial undertakings may be a question; possibly the relation is reciprocal, and it is in part cause and in part result. The significant point, however, lies just here; that by so doing the private investor adopts the Caesars as the managers and captains of his property, makes them his agents, and so in a degree and to some extent, becomes entitled to share in the gains and profits of Caesar, or of course to share his losses and failures if so it should turn out. Whatever he gets of large gains is through Caesar's skill and ability thus vicariously employed to handle his property. The share paid to property or property owners out of the industrial product is not, therefore, as some economists would have us think, paid for some dead thing, but for an active service rendered by Caesar's use of property. Property does not stand idle, a great Moloch devouring all the product of labor without any activity or return on its own part. Under Caesar's management it is a live thing performing prodigies of work otherwise impossible to be done. Property that renders no service gets nothing, untilled land, uncut timber, vacant city lots, idle machinery, empty ships, pay nothing to their owners.

The problem of wealth and poverty comes back therefore to the personal equation, to the difference in personal ability. The laboring man gets the smaller wage because that is what his labor produces, what, if laboring alone, he could get by it. The question of living wages, of moral or legal rights has no place; for nature, the real and final paymaster of wages, does not suffer it. Nature pays wages to capital and labor, to Caesar and his legionary, not according to any rule of moral right; she simply pays or refuses to pay, and that is the end of it, without any regard to consequences either to Caesar or to his legionary; their survival or destruction is a matter of complete indifference.

Observe that it is not according to the amount of his labor, but merely according to his efficiency, that each man is paid; that is nature's method and we alter it at our peril. Nature pays by success and by success alone;



whether in early and simple, or modern and complicated industries. She puts every one back to the grab all of primitive living in which there are no rights, no sentiments, simply "has" or "has not."

Karl Marx, the great apostle of labor's rights, looked at the problem from quite another point of view; he did not ask the all-important, and as it seems, essential, question, how are wages paid and by whom, but chose to regard the formal bargaining of the employer and employee as the essential elements in the problem. It is quite legitimate to take this view and to work out the problem as a sale of labor or laborer's time to the employer, but it does not seem so fruitful a conception as to examine how wages are really paid and from that to proceed to a discussion of the true measure of wages. When a laborer works by himself, obtaining by his own labor useful things from nature, we know very well how and in what manner he receives his wages and their measure. That any great change should be wrought by his working with others and on a larger scale, does not seem probable since he does no more work and makes no greater exertion than when laboring alone. For wages under all circumstances are paid, as already noted, by nature and by nature alone; they are the uncertain rewards received from nature by labor. Note the adjective; it is of high significance. When laboring alone, dealing directly with nature so to speak, it is a matter of uncertainty whether the laborer gets what he seeks, his wages, or not; if he fail, not the most wrong-headed labor agitator would exclaim at the injustice or the unfairness of his case.

Now one of the most important features brought about by the combination of laborers in a single undertaking, and their payment by an employer, is the removal of this uncertainty. The employer takes nature's place and undertakes to pay the laborer surely on a day a certain fixed wage. The advantages of this to the laborer needs no comment; immediate payment is to him a necessity. In other words, the true view of the wage problem is that no labor is paid except in results; that without results, the best labor goes unpaid; that the employer buys from

the laborer, not his time nor his labor (although he may measure his payment in those terms), but buys the laborer's share of results and he buys the result at once, every day as it is produced, and takes upon himself the risk of there being any useful final result. It is only out of results of the labor that the final payment is made; he advances the payment and expects to be reimbursed from results; without results he would soon lose his ability to pay. He buys from them their share of the results which nature is expected to render in return for their combined labors and his payments are merely payments of anticipated results. How often captains of industry fail to get results; how often great enterprises, upon which millions of money and thousands of men have been employed come to nought, thus making waste of both capital and labor, need not be particularly pointed out; canals that do not get dug; railroads that are but streaks of rust; ships that will not sail; machinery and inventions that do not work; the thousands of experiments that are continually going on in the industrial world and coming to nought after perhaps years of patient toil; these testify to the risks taken and the burden placed on the Caesars of these laboring armies.

If it be argued, as it might well be, that every workman is as much under Caesar's direction as the property placed in his care, and should, like the property, share in Caesar's results, it must be pointed out that there is a fundamental difference. The property in Caesar's hands shares Caesar's fortunes; like Caesar it is paid only in final results, results that are uncertain, and distant, depending upon the success of the undertaking, and getting nothing if that undertaking fail. While the laborer's wages are paid in any event, and immediately, he does not share Caesar's fortunes or take the chances of final failure. This is not a trifling, but a fundamental difference, and it turns on that personal equation which is the very crux and pivot of all modern economic discontent. One man in a thousand has the ability or genius, the judgment, what you will, of natural endowment, to conduct what he undertakes to a successful issue. That



quality is of inestimable value; we need not trouble ourselves explaining why or what it is, suffice it for our purpose that some men have it, and that it is of all degrees, from the ability to conduct a shoe store or a grocery, to running a railroad, building a steamship, or conducting a military campaign. On the other hand, there is a corresponding want of this in the average man; a disability to see further than his nose or think beyond the working day. Give a man so wanting a store or a railroad, and no matter what the number of millions put at his disposal, he and those with him would have nothing after a few years. This is no theoretical statement, but a sad and practical truth. If we face the truth we will see that the average laborer or working man is not capable of earning more than his daily wage; that is all he could get by himself; why should he, in the name of justice, claim more when working no harder in collaboration with others? It may seem a Democratic treason to state the bold facts but the average man is stupid in many ways. It is a saying so well and universally accepted that it commands our respect, that out of one hundred men in business, ninety fail. Those who have studied the problem of poverty scientifically, declare that much of the suffering and poverty are due, not to fortune, but to personal failings. If we wish more specific evidence of the average stupidity, look at the patent medicine advertisements, the get-rich-quick schemes, the various swindles that flourish to the extent of millions of dollars taken from the average man who knows no better. Nothing is too crude or too foolish for some people to believe. A hospital physician relates that a patient was brought in on one occasion redolent of kerosene, of which he had swallowed a tumblerful because some one told him it was good for a cold. Another on some like statement swallowed a bottle of liniment.

In plain words, these inequalities of fortune, these vast discrepancies in wages paid to Caesar and to his laborers, are the result of natural, not of artificial, unfair, human contrivances. All the facts point this way if we examine them impartially; a man gets wealth or suffers poverty, not because of unfair rules made by society, but because



and in proportion to his ability to render useful services to society. The man who really is of use very soon is rewarded to the full value of that use. Here at random are a few instances from the daily papers, giving initials only, of the men: F. W. W. started at \$8.00 per week in a lumber yard, not the pay of an ordinary day laborer; he is now head of several businesses at a salary of \$30,000.00 a year. W. A. G. was a telegraph operator at \$26.00 per month; he is now president of a great railway at something like \$50,000.00 a year. C. H. M. in 1881 got \$1.25 per day as a section laborer; he is now president of a railway company at \$50,000.00 a year. These, in other words, were all Caesars in their little way, and for want of them the enterprises of modern life would all go astray. There, for another example, was the great undertaking of the New York subways, involving capital expenditure of three hundred millions and over; all was confusion and chaos until Shonts was begged to take charge at a salary of \$100,000.00 a year. What is true of these striking examples is true in a lesser degree of others, who, according to their ability, have received proportionate rewards in wages. In other words, opportunity often lacks capacity; capacity seldom lacks opportunity.

All this is purely theoretical by way of answering the general and sweeping objections made to the great wages or wealth of some industrial laborers as compared with the small wages or poverty of others. That laborers are sometimes paid less than they deserve, that their needy situation may be taken advantage of by unscrupulous employers, impeaches not at all the validity of the general argument. Unscrupulous men in all walks of life take advantage of their fellows; one Caesar robs another just as he robs his employees. Notwithstanding all of which the great natural methods of payment of wages to efficiency and by results prevail and govern the relations of all laborers to each other.

What is the just measure of wages in any one instance may be very difficult to ascertain with any degree of accuracy. But when the cry of all the labor agitators is for



a just wage, surely the first question to be answered is, how and on what principles are we to proceed to divide the results of the joint labors of a great body of laborers; for it is only out of the product of their labor that any wages can be paid; labor without results gets no wages, and great results can only be produced by the great combinations of capital and labor, which require these Caesars to command them, and which yield to those Caesars the high rewards in wages which they get, while the laborer is paid, not as of old when he fished and dug for himself, by results, but by those artificial substitutes for results, the wages of the capitalist who insures to him his wages at once and with absolute certainty. These are all plain commonplaces that we all know, recognize for true the moment they are placed before us, for it is the law, not of man, but of nature, who alone pays labor and by this hard rule of success without regard to amount of labor or moral deserts. There is no dispensation from the rule so that all who would show the injustice of any given wages to the laborer must start with this premise or not at all; no eloquence or declamation can alter it.

Perhaps in a different world an altruistic, benevolent, but artificial society, those eloquent declamations about the rights of labor to various enjoyments might have place; in natural conditions they have no place, are mere dogmatic assertions. They have a life, a validity of their own, but it is in a wholly different sphere. They strike root in religion and in the altruistic feeling of which it alone furnishes the sure foundation. In the world of Socialists, labor agitators, anarchists, Communists and the like social reformers, religion which is the only basis for their altruistic doctrines, finds no countenance; they for the most part reject the religious attitude that all men are brothers and owe to each other love, kindness and goodwill. Their plea is for justice, and they often seek to enforce it by violence; they set aside as rubbish all the Christian doctrines of the brotherhood of man. Christianity being rejected, we are perforce compelled in our search for what is just, for what is lawfully the laborer's

share of products, to confine ourselves to the logic of cold facts, not as they should be in some altruistic state, but as they are.

If by our substitution of a human employer for nature and a method of payment other than by luck or chance or skill we give to the laborer certain advantages in certainty and in promptness of return to his labor, it is not logical that he should accept these advantages and yet complain of the burden that goes with them; he cannot have the transaction both ways; he cannot accept the certainty of an immediate result for his labor and claim at the same time the advantage of an uncertain future result, should that result eventually be obtained, but in regard to the obtaining of which he took no risk.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*



## ARTICLE V.

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION AS APPROPRIATED  
BY SOCIALISM.

BY REV. A. J. TRAVER.

Twenty years ago Evolution was the battlefield of Christianity and Atheism. The word, innocent and harmless in itself, when defining a deistic philosophy becomes not merely a descriptive law of development. It neglects Providence and explains history as the record of an automatic, continuous and eternal movement toward some final state of society. Evolution is opposed to the idea that the world was created practically as it now stands and that new forms of life or new stages in the world's history are the results of new conscious acts on the part of a creator.

With evolution, as thus defined, this paper is interested. It is by no means a recent doctrine. Though Darwinism has become a synonym for evolution the ancient Greeks reduced matter to an original substance from which grew the latter and varied forms of life. Thales chose water as the original substance; Anaximenes, air; Anaximander philosophized for moisture under the influence of warmth. He also threw out the suggestion that man is a development from lower stages of animal life. Plato and Aristotle suggested as a goal for development a certain sort of God-likeness while the latter mentioned the ape as the possible missing link between animals and man. In medieval times the Church Father Augustine used evolutionary methods in his treatment of history, and the free-lance philosopher of the wanderlust, Bruno, identified matter with form and used the law of continuous development. Coming down to modern philosophy, Descartes and Leibnitz use the same law in explaining progress. Leibnitz says, "The present is the child of the past, but the parent of the future." Kant entertains the thought that "an orangoutang or a chimpanzee may develop organs which serve for walking,

grasping objects and speech—in short that may evolve the structure of a man with an organ for the use of reason which shall gradually develop itself by social culture.” Schelling follows Kant with a purer evolutionary theory of the relation of nature to reason. Finally in Darwin and Spencer we have the development of life in its varied forms wholly through the laws of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. Although the phrase “We may well suppose,” occurs over 800 times in his two principal works, Darwin’s fame rests in his use of ascertained facts as proof for his theory and in his clear statement of its principles. Spencer broadened the theory to include the whole range of nature.

The pronouncement of the theory by Darwin set the theological world agog. Science ranged against religion and religion against science. Extreme views of the one brought forth extreme views of the other. Only very recently have the rival camps been able in any measure to view their differences with calmness. Under the new and less excitable spirit of the age and under the leadership of such scientists as John Fiske, Newman Smyth, Geo. A. Gardner and Sir Oliver Lodge, the breach is being healed.

This paper is interested mainly with evolution as it has been related to the progress of society as opposed to the earlier and most noticed application of the theory to the development of the individual. The Christian apologetes have attacked evolution mainly as it was used to explain the natural world and the origin of man, finding in this the destruction of Biblical accuracy. The bold assertion that the history of society shows a long line of continuous development under its own laws has gone comparatively unchallenged. It is strange that more emphasis has not been laid on this phase of the development of evolutionary thought. Darwin himself confessed that he obtained the clue to his theory while reading the sociologist, Malthus; while Spencer, always more sociologist than philosopher, traces even Christianity from a common origin with other religions in primitive ancestor worship.

But it was Karl Marx, patron saint of socialism, who was, Liebnicht tells us, the first to realize the importance of Darwin’s loudly acclaimed theory to sociology. The



main principles of evolution he incorporated into his system, making it the scientific basis of socialism. We are not surprised then to read from the pen of that most gifted and readable apostle of socialism, John Spargo, that socialism is "in its modern sense a theory of social evolution." Christian apologetics must gather new ammunition and devise a different type of gun. It was well enough twenty years ago to worry about Darwinism but today a new enemy faces Christianity. Out of Darwinism grew Marxism and though discredited or rather unnoticed at first the economic interpretation of history has been gaining followers by the hundreds in the 20th century. We trust that this paper will indicate that the most insidious as well as the most open and bold intellectual foe that modern Christianity must overcome is found not in Geology, not in Biology, not in Philosophy but in Sociology and specially in that theory of Sociology which is the heart and life of Socialism. The entrance of many Christians, both clergy and lay, into the study of social service and the accompanying theories of sociology has endangered thousands of untrained minds. The high sounding phrases of socialism with its championship of the weak and its war against poverty have appealed to the heart and imagination of the sincere. Underneath this innocent bait is hidden a barbed hook and many of those who have swallowed socialism have done so at the price of their spiritual life. The appeal to the nobility of service is but a veneer over the infidelity and rottenness of economic determinism. To expose this theory is the purpose of this paper.

In 1859 Marx wrote in his famous preface to "The Critique of Political Economy," "the totality of these relations of production forms the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which a legal and political superstructure rises, and to which definite social forms of consciousness correspond. The mode of production in material life conditions the social, political and spiritual life-processes in general. It is not man's consciousness that determines his existence but conversely his social existence determines his consciousness." In 1913 Prof.

Murdoch of Rensselaer Polytechnic in his book, "Ethics and Economics," proved the agreement of modern socialism with these principles of its founder in the following words: "Disarm it how one may, the pursuit of the economic direct and indirect, breaks through every manifestation of human consciousness for consciousness can not continue apart from food, clothing, shelter, the creation and distribution of the material means, instruments and products of economic activity," and on another page he affirms that "the foundation of the whole man is material. History is but the evolution of economics."

In "Socialism and the Present Day" Jessie Wallace Hughan arrives at a similar understanding. Socialism explains "the political and intellectual history of an epoch by the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following it and is often termed by the Socialists 'the material conception of history or economic determinism.'" Prof. Vedder, a sympathetic critic of Socialism sums up his understanding of the doctrine in "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus," as follows: "The basic problem of man in all ages has been the problem of subsistence, how to get a living out of the earth. The primal necessity has conditioned and directed all social development. The conditions of physical life, the relations of production to consumption are prime factors in human progress. The transformations of society, the growth of institutions are all traceable to economic conditions and all history is at bottom a struggle between nations and classes for the control of the means of subsistence."

Very often the unwary will be led to believe that Socialism does not teach rabid materialism but recognizes spiritual forces as effective agents in forming society. However in practically every case the Socialist apologete if driven to the wall will admit that while ideas are often immediate determining causes for action yet the final cause is material. Criticising Prof. Ely, Spargo writes, " 'All that is significant in human history may be traced back to ideas,' he says, truly all that is significant in human history may be traced back to ideas but in like man-



ner the ideas themselves may be traced back to materialism." Labriola, another gifted Socialist writer, in his "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History" frankly maintains that "It is not the forms of consciousness that finally determine the human being but it is the manner of being that determines the consciousness."

For a moment then let us put on the amber colored spectacles of socialism and read the pages of history. Spargo holds that assuming the life of the race to be 100,000 years at least 95,000 were spent in a crude tribal communism. At length out of tribal wars the inspiration came that a live enemy in captivity had economic value. So arose slavery and with it developed a leisure class. This latter class gave us Grecian art and commerce. In the days of Rome luxury demanded heavier taxation on land and slavery became less and less profitable. Great estates broke up and numberless slaves were freed. Thus serfdom was ushered into the world. This developed into the feudalism of the middle ages. God was the great King, to earthly kings He entrusted the land, these in turn for tribute trusted their lands to barons, the barons to lesser nobility, they to freemen and they in turn to the serfs. The whole reason for this change from slavery to feudalism was economic. At length free laborers found profit in specialization on particular trades and co-operation with their fellows. The trade guilds followed. Then wealthy families began to furnish materials, tools and workshops and the age of capitalism was on. Finally capitalists found profit in co-operation and the modern trust was born. And now looking to the future the socialist claims no fears from the concentration of capital, believing that just as feudalism followed slavery, and capitalism followed feudalism, so socialism will inevitably follow capitalism. As another writer, Loria, in the "Economic Foundations of Society" points out, "The ultimate economic form, while presenting the highest stage of development and nearest approach to perfection will at the same time differ less than any of the preceding systems from the primitive social structure."

This resumé of history may not seem particularly dan-

gerous at first glance. The economic motive seems to be present in each transformation of social form. But how does this general theory affect our understanding of the more specific events in history? The discovery of America was not due to the idealism of an inspired dreamer but to the economic necessity for another route to India. The American Revolution, as a certain socialist points out, was not fought for an ideal, liberty, but for the very material question of taxation, to quote: "Its roots were in the economic discontent of an exploited people." The Civil War arose because slavery was unprofitable in the north and had nothing to do with any doctrines of human equality except in-so-far as such doctrines were the reflex of the economics of the situation. The Spanish-American War was brought on the nations by a group of capitalists owning lands in Cuba and Porto Rico and such spiritual causes as sympathy and love of justice were blatant hypocrisy.

Logically, the socialist has not forgotten the great religious movements of history. Says Spargo, "to affirm that Luther created the Protestant Reformation is to ignore the great economic changes consequent upon the break-up of feudalism and the beginning of a new industrial order." Labriola, still more in detail, affirms that "Martin Luther never knew as we know to-day, that the Reformation was but an episode in the development of the Third Estate and an economic revolt of the German nation against the exploitation of the Papal Court. He was what he was, an agitator and a politician, because he was wholly taken up with the belief that made him see in the class movement which gave impetus to the agitation, a return to primitive Christianity and a divine necessity in the vulgar course of events. With the study of remote effects, that is to say, the increasing strength of the bourgeoisie, of the cities against the feudal lords, the increase of the territorial dominion of the princes at the expense of the inter-territorial and super-territorial dominion of the emperor and pope, the violent repression of the peasants and the properly proletarian movement of the Anabaptists, permit us now to reconstruct the authentic his-



tory of the economic causes of the Reformation, particularly in the final proportions which it took, which is the best of proofs." So does Socialism dispose of a great religious movement which we have held almost with reverence as the outgrowth of the inspired ideal of religious liberty in the heart of a great good man. It is to be explained not from anything so spiritual as the directing hand of God, rather do we look for its first cause on the high spiritual (?) plane of "victuals and drink."

But surely there is some great movement that is purely spiritual, some great man who rather than being merely the reflex of the age is an inspired leader drawing his power as well as his plan from his communion with a personal God. Permit Loria to answer this question: "We may therefore say with truth because it is an undeniable fact, that economic motives did predominate on Golgotha . . . .since it was the reaction of property against threatened socialistic reforms that brought Jesus to the cross." Logical conclusion of economic determinism, Jesus, teacher of liberty, equality and fraternity, champion of the people against privilege, dies for the sake of the menaced pocketbooks of the wealthy. The cross then stands eternally as the emblem of the first victory in the wars of the classes. If the fountain head of Christianity is disposed of, thus, what of the field of present day religion? Socialism can hardly be charged with interest in heaven, the Kingdom of God being a material goal. The clergyman and theological professor, Rauschenbusch writes, "The spread of evolutionary ideas is another mark of modern religious thought. It has opened a vast historical outlook backward and forward and trained us in bold conceptions of the upward climb of the race. It has prepared us for understanding the reign of God, toward which all creation is moving. Translate the evolutionary theories into religious faith and you have the doctrine of the Kingdom of God." With him agrees that infidel teacher of our youth, Prof. Murdoch. Religious activity is to be found "not in the pursuing of merely abstract ethical and religious principles—usually derived from and reflecting an antiquated economic status and misapplied

to the new conditions—but in putting power at the right point, namely the material economic connection of the individual and of society. Change these, wait patiently on natural selection and the desired result will surely follow: or better said, use the reason that can foresee the effects of nature's processes and with clear intentions further the inevitable outcome." This is the sum and substance of socialistic religion, social amelioration. This is the kind of doctrine that is not proclaimed upon the house tops. But taken from their own textbooks, the economic basis of society is the scientific foundation of the system of socialism, and the paper so far has simply attempted to arrive at their definition. "Here," in the words of Washington, "perhaps I ought to stop." However there are certain outgrowths of economic determinism, partially treated in defining the theory that might be considered more at length. These show socialism to be not only inherently anti-Christian but also dangerously degrading.

In the first place economic determinism is materialistic, occupied with this world only. The logical believer freely admits with Keir Hardie that "one of the basic principles of socialism is ultra-materialism." The soap-box orator disdains the church as being other-worldly, a dreamer's religion, an apology for things as they are and should not be, the dispenser of a salve to soothe the suffering of humanity rather than a bitter enemy of conditions which allow this misery. Prof. Karl Pearson, writing in the English "Free Thought Magazine" says, "The modern socialistic theory is based on the agnostic theory of the supersensuous. Man is concerned only in the present life . . . .not from fear of hell, not from hope of heaven, from no love of tortured man-god—but solely for the sake of society." The Italian Ferri accords with his English brother that "Socialism tends to substitute itself for religion because it desires that humanity should have in itself its own terrestrial paradise without having to wait for it in a 'something beyond' which to say the least is problematical." Added to this is the testimony of Prof. Flint in a volume called "Socialism." He writes, "Its ad-



vocates assail the belief in God and immortality as not only in itself superstition but as a chief obstacle to the conception of their teaching and the triumph of their cause."

What a joyous doctrine they teach. Bald materialism. "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." "Dust to dust, ashes to ashes" dreamers, we are called, yet if ever there was a wild dream it was the dream of the man who saw a world-brotherhood, founded on materialism. If death ends all, then might makes right, selfishness is a virtue and co-operation is a name for the yoke that binds jealousy to suspicion.

Materialism is the religion of pessimism. What wonder that Vida Scudder writes toward the latter part of her book on "Socialism and Character." "In looking back over the field traversed by this book it may seem to some as if our argument had fallen away from the high religious grounds taken at the outset and sagged down to the level of mere economic discussion." Certainly some apology is due the patient reader who hopes for comfort between the covers of a volume dedicated to Socialism. For to sign under the Red Flag means the renunciation of faith for sight, of bright hope for joyless resignation, of God-inspired love, for frank egotism. The explanations of Socialism do not explain, the enthusiasm of Socialism does not encourage and the doctrine of Socialism, if true, in the face of a real live personal problem like death would not be worth the price of the red rag that flies over them.

Again there is the sister doctrine to materialism, fatalism. It involves the denial of Providence as an active agent in history. This belief like many of the central tenets of socialism, finds its inspiration in the writings of the speculative philosophers. For instance Leibnitz says, "Those who assume that the Creator constantly intervenes in his work regard God as an unskillful watchmaker who cannot make a perfect machine but must continually repair what He has made. Not only does God not intervene at every moment but He never intervenes."

This belief was incorporated into socialism at birth. Prof. Vedder calls Marxism, "Calvinism without God." He adds this criticism, "This idea of Marx if true would leave no place for the ethical indignation that he frequently shows over economic wrong-doing." Modern socialistic views are perhaps best stated by Loria, "Human necessity is subjected to laws of its own which develop automatically and against which man can not rebel."

This is not the kind of argument however that is dealt out to possible converts. Spargo becomes indignant at the thought of the charge that socialism is fatalistic. Why, he affirms, we recognize all complex feelings, emotions, aspirations, hopes and fears common to man. But we really understand him better after reading his whole argument and finding economic causes behind these complex feelings. The English brother Blatschford is frank if not so polished when he writes in the *Clarion*, "I deny the existence of a Heavenly Father, I deny the efficacy of prayer, I deny the Providence of God."

The Socialist then in his struggle for freedom, for equality, for brotherhood, turns his back upon the outstretched arms of God and chooses rather the mailed embrace of the jailor, he spurns the liberty of sonship and deliberately accepts what Spencer called "The New Slavery." Well has Father Vaughn, the Catholic opponent of Socialism declared, "Under Socialism even though men had plenty to eat and drink and wherewith to be clothed and sheltered, they would not be free."

What a precious pair of doctrines to take with us as clergymen into the homes of death. No heaven with its reunion joys and no kindly Providence directing the affairs of man. What wonder we find the vein of sadness but thinly veiled in the writing of modern socialists. Loria admits that "Economic determinism is 'a dismal doctrine' as our late lamented friend Dr. Laveleye remarked, which seeks to lower the human race in our eyes by showing it to be governed exclusively by sordid material interests. But alas! we must answer these belated moralists that the cynicism is inherent in the conditions themselves, which could not indeed be sadder—and not in the



minds of those who frankly set forth the things as they are." Labriola speaks in similar strain of the government of the world as "a divine comedy." Even that most buoyant socialist missionary, Prof. Murdoch, finds nature so cruel and inexplicable in her dealings that the idea of a Providence would send one to the mad-house. Just how he keeps out from the mad-house after disposing of Providence he does not tell us. It would seem that he must rest his mind on the golden text of fatalism, what must be, must be. If this explains the riddles of the universe he is welcome to the explanation.

One more sweet sister in the socialist family and we will rest our case. Socialism if not immoral is unmoral. It has no ten commandments. Standards of morality are not fixed but are the changing reflection of the social forms of the age. Speaking of the mutability of science, Prof. Murdoch says, "Wholly of the same piece is the emptiness of absolute ethics, eternal right, justice and goodness." Therefore having condemned the present social form, the modern socialist condemns the moral standards. Nay even more than this our present standard of morals, they tell us, is made up of "a series of regulations imposed by the owning class upon the laboring class in opposition to their real egoism." The people are then actually "handicapped by their inveterate morality." Benjamin Kidd is authority for the assertion that Bax defends stealing from corporations, such as railroads, telephone companies, etc., claiming that the law, "Thou shalt not steal" was made by those who have to protect their property against those who have not. We understand the following quotation from a socialist daily, "It may be convenient for Socialism, with a view to expediency to seek to confine the definition to the economic issue, abstracted from all other issues of life and conduct." The final moral law then is not truth but seeming expediency. Enlightened self-interest, not love, is the moral law of the final society. If so we want to know how it is enlightened.

The result of the denial of moral standards that are eternal is that each socialist attempts to construct the moral standards of the final and perfected form of so-

ciety. He then tries to live under that standard in the present. Result, each socialist has his own dream as to the final society and therefore there may be as many moral standards as socialists. He who lends to a believer in the pious doctrine of economic determinism takes his chance. Will he repay the debt? He says so. Does he believe in the old command "Thou shalt not bear false witness?" He says so. Well and good, but it might be safe to make sure the papers are legally drawn for after the bargain is made who knows whether it may not become expedient and in accord with the present state of his enlightened self-interest to forget his obligation, specially since the lender made the law. This sounds harsh, it is harsh. In no sense would this paper question the average truth and honesty of socialists. But the point that is of interest is that socialism, founded upon materialism, fatalism and shifting moral standards offers a possibility of human brotherhood with about the same consistency as the socialist gentleman pays his grocery bill when he needs a new suit of clothes. Only so far as socialism is illogical could it accomplish its most worthy object, the federation of mankind.

This paper has already overstepped its intended bounds. We trust that the true nature of the intellectual foundation of socialism has been exposed. We admire the devotion as well as the ability of many modern socialists. But we believe there can be no compromise between their doctrine and ours. If there is such a hybrid thing as a Christian-Socialist we would not hold it malice. However we believe that in so far as it is Christian it is not socialistic. If Christian and Socialist find themselves working side by side for the same things, well and good, but the intellectual basis for the service is as different as spiritualism and materialism.

Finally, then, how shall we treat the doctrine of evolution as applied to history? It can be accepted only in so far as it is descriptive of God's method with the world and does not pretend to power to move itself. Dr. Wright of Oberlin, writing in volume 7 of "The Fundamentals" on "The Passing of Evolution," says: "Of this, as of every



other variety of evolution, it can be truly said, in the words of one of the most distinguished physicists, Clerk-Maxwell, 'I have examined all that have come within my reach, and have found that every one must have a god to make it work.' ” Indeed a Burbank is needed in the development of social forms just as in the development of plants. Just as the cultivated rose, neglected, will degenerate, so will man, under the grim law of necessity go down deeper and deeper into sin and its consequent misery. There are great steps to be taken in progress that need God's hand. Man travels up the stony steeps to a perfect society with his hand in the invisible hand of God. Slowly and painfully, with age-long steps, he mounts. Here and there across his path stretch wide chasms. Impossible it seems that he should cross. Civilization seems doomed. But taking a firmer hold on the hand of the Father, he ventures the leap and by a strength not his own man has past another world crisis. This is the Christian interpretation of history.

What a vast difference in view point. Socialism and Christianity both agree in progress as a law of life but while the one exalts soul, the other exalts the body, while the one depends upon enlightened self-interest the other bases its only reliance on God-like and God-inspired love, the one looking back sees the world developing under the laws of that blind God necessity, the other sees the hand of the Father, the one looking at the present sees the world running amuck in a continuous war of the classes, the other recognizes sin as the enslaver of all classes and discerns with spiritual eyes the rescuing presence of Christ, looking ahead, the one sees the dead level of co-operative aimlessness in which the reward for work is food and clothing, while the prizes go to the popular, the other looking forward sees the Kingdom of God, the communion of the saints, the combination of the children of the Heavenly Father, heirs through Jesus living under the banner of service and finding their highest rewards in the approval of the Father, their highest inspiration in the friendship of the Elder Brother, and their highest law a love that finds its highest expression in the cross.

To close with the words of that great Christian scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge, from "The Substance of Faith":

"The Kingdom of Heaven is the central feature of practical Christianity. It represents a harmonious condition in which the Divine Will is perfectly obeyed; it signifies the highest state of existence, both individual and social, which we can conceive. Our whole effort should directly or indirectly make ready its way in our hearts, in our lives and in the lives of others. It is the ideal state of society toward which we are striving, it is the ideal of conscious existence towards which all saints aim."

*New York, N. Y.*



## ARTICLE VI.

INNER MISSION—ITS GOAL.<sup>1</sup>

BY REV. W. H. FELDMAN.

Hamilton in his *Metaphysics* says, "His (man's) perfection and happiness constitute the goal of his activity." This I presume would receive the assent of everybody. It is one of those general statements that all can indorse, yet all interpret variously. This is the claim of the Christian, the humanitarian, the altruist, the socialist, and the vote-getting politician. Yet all of these differ.

When it comes to defining what sort of perfection and what kind of happiness is meant, then great diversity of opinion arises. However, we are little concerned as to what the world may conceive it to be, or how it seeks to attain its goal. We have a clearly defined and exactly prescribed course to pursue in order to reach our goal. It is this! Anything that is to bear the name of Christian, by that very term, has clearly set forth the purpose of its place and mission. Furthermore, this very name for Protestant, and above all Lutheran Christianity, means that it will and must find its authority and source of strength in the Word alone. Luther had this conception when he said, "Das Wort muss es thun." The Word must do it! This is our limitation, but it is also our power. The Christ we know came not to start a work that was to be finished by Him in His day, and then turn the world loose on another mad career of ignorance and folly, but He declared His work to be for all ages, for all conditions of humanity and every need of human kind. His Word stands for us, as Inner Mission workers, as the one superlative test. It is the touchstone of every act! When, therefore, we adhere most closely to it, then we accomplish most truly the happiness and perfection of mankind. The Word stands first.

The Bible and the teaching which our Lord proclaimed, and which is preached from our pulpits, is not merely a

<sup>1</sup> Read at the Open Conference of Inner Mission Workers of the Lutheran Church held in New York City.

set of well-defined phrases that are to be committed to memory; but it is also a book of service. With this book goes an actuating principle which the Holy Ghost inspires. This inspiration vitalizes every act that has been laid down in that book for us to do! Inner Mission service, then, is the explanation and application of the Word of God to the affairs of daily life as they are worked out in concrete acts in the world around us. In other words, Inner Mission takes its living principle and makes it a principle of living. It is, in a sense, another explanation and another application of the Word of God. This makes the Word a twice-born book for every Christian worker. It saves his soul and sanctifies his services.

Not only must it do this to be true to its Master, but it must do it also for its own sake! The Bible must be the motivating force of all service to keep it pure and free from grievous sins and errors, which so easily creep into our work at best; and which would play into the hands of the devil in the finest fashion, because it comes under the guise of religion, wears the badge of respectability and accepts the honors of piety. False principles cannot father true practices. Other services may fall away from their essential principles and not suffer harm, but in our work it means death. When we do it, we are not debasing the currency, but injecting a deadly virus that will kill and consume.

Furthermore, it must be true to its call for the sake of avoiding misunderstanding on the part of him or her to whom we minister! The worker must never shine, the Word must always be in the foreground. He who is blest must see that Jesus has sent it by the way of the "Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these my brethren" channel. We must never forget that there is a sin of false conduct, as well as a sin of false teaching of the Word! Practice may be polluted as well as precept perverted; and the old heresy that it makes no difference as to what you believe so long as the sufferer is helped, is all wrong in spite of all contradiction! All must be done according to the Word.

That Word to which we are to be loyal, shows us very



clearly what we must stress if we would keep in accord with its plan. I need hardly tell you that the whole scheme of that Word, from its first page to the last, is the glorification of the Saviour. The gospel of Genesis begins it and the song of Moses and the Lamb will be the unending anthem through all the eternities of the new Jerusalem. Christ first, Christ everywhere, "that Christ may be all in all." This holds true in a very special sense of Inner Mission. It is just as incumbent on us to say in our Inner Mission work, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified" as it was for Paul to declare it to the Corinthians. He is man's perfection and man's happiness; and anything we offer that does not include this Christ, yea, that does not put Him in the fore is not true to the high calling of our faith; nor to the Word that magnifies that Christ above angels and principalities and powers. We must ever seek, then, to glorify that Lord! The reason is not hard to find, for God the Father did it! And this is proof enough for us that we are right when we give Him the first place not only in our worship but in service, even as God gave Him the same from the very throne of heaven. This is, alas! not always done. An error exists here which, in many respects, resembles the false statement made by some who hold the Sunday School as equal to and some even superior to the Church; forgetting that the promise is made to the Church, not to the Sunday School. So it is here, when works of mercy are made more of than the Jesus Himself, then all is wrong. It is commonly put in this wise, "His creed can't be wrong whose life is right," but because a good thought has prompted it, that does not make it right. The story of the cobbler in Constantinople, who pitied the poor boys and made them shoes from leather stolen from his master is to the point. Particularly must we hold this before us, when we recall that we are striving to revive those who have lost their first love in Him and would not possibly need us, were it not for that fall. They must see Him, not us,—not even the act! Let us never forget what we said above, how that Word makes Him the chief concern! We still stand with

Paul, "Knowing nothing save Christ!" The glory of the Lutheran Church is that it makes everything personal in her system of salvation and begins with a personal Christ in the Scriptures, and insists on personal service to our fellowman because of Him.

In line with this assertion, we would further emphasize the fact that this makes for personal salvation, not only of the soul but also of the body! The man who is in need of material aid, must see in the cup of water handed him the image of Christ. "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed," so the epistle tells us. Then the world around us is merely a symbol made to embody and declare the glory of God and always brings us back to Him; especially if the beggarly elements have ensnared us and throttled our faith. So it must be with our service to man. Any service that does not make this truth shine will not do Christ's kingdom one bit of good, no matter how the body fares! It matters not what the world may say about it, our standard is fixed! There is no genuine uplift in the eyes of Inner Mission workers that fails to lead to the Christ! Honestly do we believe that there never was more money spent and less real charity done than today! Fat bodies may have lean souls! It is true, even as it was said by Him who hungered, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The cross uplifts the body as well as the soul! The world calls this fanciful.

Lest any might say that a too spiritual aspect is given to the matter of religion, we reply that the works of Jesus, Who went about doing good, will completely kill the force of all such criticism. The pages of Scripture teem with the deeds of help and cure that He performed. He knew, as none ever did, or will, how our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost; but He also warns of the place it is to take in the order of importance! It decidedly comes second; but second in such a way as not to be *secondary*! If it is a fair comparison, we would use the words of Christ when referring to the commandments, "The first is, thou shalt love the Lord thy God



with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The "like unto" is second not *secondary*. The second side of the sheet of paper is necessary in order to have the first. The reverse of a coin always goes with the obverse. This makes plain our controlling thought. We are to do the one for the sake and because of the other. Physical claims are legitimate because of spiritual ends and worth. The body is to be saved because Christ died for it and the words of the Scriptures are ever to be observed in rendering service, that "your whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless." The body, then, has worth because of the soul from which it cannot be torn!

It is well for us to note how the world is looking at this matter of the body. The physical welfare of man is being considered as never before. Its relation to capital and labor are subjects of deepest study on the part of those who are interested in the physical body as capital of the nation. Healthy men and women are a national asset. Men are beginning to see that a nation cannot afford to be sick; for instance, for business reasons! Health is being evaluated in terms of money, time, increased cost of production through delay, and many other phases. Legislative bodies are passing "Workingmen's Compensation Acts." Liability Insurance is a common form of protection against accidents! Safety devices are introduced to protect life and limb. While we would not offer any objection to any effort that makes for the betterment of mankind, yet we cannot blind ourselves to this truth; that while all this makes for physical security, it does not touch the deep, hidden needs of man; yea, rather, courts indifference in many ways and we fear, in other ways, makes the individual more helpless and godless. There may be ways to throw safeguards around man's body; but there is no way to insure his character from the deteriorating influences that are at work in the modern industrial world! To save his limb does not save his soul. We claim that any view which omits the spiritual aspect can only pander to the baser nature of man. We



insist that the elevation of man comes to a true fruitage only when he is lifted up out of sin. There is no safety device for sin. The keen competition of the modern business world, the enervating effects of the factory and the shop, the condition of modern housing, the craze for pleasure—indulged in by poor and rich alike, the sensitiveness that the intertwining of international relations creates, and many other factors that we cannot name at this time, are all at work to make the life of today more complex than ever before—but also more corroding than ever before! Material security usually leads to spiritual indifference! This does not frighten us in the least. It only intensifies our responsibility to give to the world the true solution for all its problems. This will never be done by minimizing the body; but rather magnifying the soul! Sin today is estimated too cheaply and salvation is despised. Therefore, we can best assert the appreciation of our own salvation by the services we tender to the cause of our fellowmen; always showing that the impelling force is the Word of God which says, "The Love of Jesus Christ constraineth us."

Beautiful as all this is, let us never forget that we are not free from temptation in this matter! The devil comes not as an angel of light except where his aim is to pervert the work of Light! This is of far reaching consequence. Charity misguided is a far more efficient agency of darkness than flagrant vice unrebuked. There are real dangers and it is well for us to know them. The first baneful tendency that we wish to touch on, is that for which the Roman communion stands—work righteousness. This, in its essence, is an external, material conception of religion. In this matter, it has the human heart thoroughly in accord with its contention. Man, by nature, wants to work his way to heaven. It is too humiliating to accept the grace of God as a free gift. Man's pride is wounded when he is told that he cannot win salvation! Tell him that he can do something to help a good, but only partially strong and loving God along, and this partnership with the Almighty at once appeals to the average heart! Nor must we think that this is con-



fined to Rome alone! If we but knew it, Protestantism is filled with work righteousness people! Therefore we must never cease telling them that it is not a favor to God when we help our brethren, but the outgoing love of Jesus in our own hearts seeking expression in service to another. In a very humble way, but truly, it is the word being made life again. We do it not to be seen of men, we do it not to be praised by the person helped; we do it not to protect ourselves against the inroads of vice or poverty,—a plea so often made by charity workers; we do it because it is what God would have us do!

A certain ingrained dislike and blind opposition to Rome may save us from drifting back to that Church; yet that will not save from work righteousness! There is a more deadly force at work in the Church than that, in my humble estimation, because it is doing its work and going unchallenged! That force is pseudo-Unitarianism. This is honey-combing the entire Church. Rightly do they of that Church say, speaking of many preachers, if they were honest, they would join our Church and preach in our pulpits. Pragmatism, so-called, is at work; and many sincere men who think they are right, who have the right name but the wrong notion, are deceived and deceiving others by doing those things that they think are the sum total of Christianity! They talk much of being practical and getting results. They despise the etherially ethical, as they would call it. Cause and effect, are favorite words with them. They want to see something done. These and many other catch-words, meant in all sincerity,—and all the more harmful because they are sincerely meant,—are at work in the Church to the detriment of souls. Laymen who are accustomed to do things, while meaning well, are often the arch enemies of the Church they undoubtedly love! These are impatient with any scheme that does not yield an immediate return like their several businesses! We must never forget “that the spirit bloweth where it listeth,” and that this holds for the physical as well as the spiritual! Pragmatism wedded to cause and effect is external, whereas Christianity is inward and spiritual and beyond



the ken of the eye. This I conceive to be the gravest danger of modern Protestantism—and we will do well to avoid this most alluring form of work righteousness.

In the foregoing we referred to the attitude the world was taking to the workingman and his physical welfare, but we saw only a part of the picture; for we must mark its real incentive! We believe it to be an ethical materialism. This world is getting to be more moral and more godless at one and the same time! It is getting away from the crude forms of vice and sin as they are shockingly done and is assuming a certain amount of external culture. This is merely a veneer. Figuratively putting it, the world is deserting the mining-camp, with its rowdyism that is open and genuine, and adapting itself to the etiquette of Monte Carlo. The gang-men wear diamonds and have their nails manicured! Of course, the latter does not offend the canons of good taste! It is extremely proper—without touching the conscience or the soul. We will illustrate. For instance, manufacturers are wise enough to see that a drunken man is not as good a workman as a sober one. The latter turns out more and better goods and is not likely to cause accident to himself or the machine. The State is aroused likewise. Crime is costly and must be paid for! It is neither practical nor pleasant! In other words, the world sees that crime and vice—sin, as we would call it—does not pay, and for this reason it must be abolished! Every word of this is true; we long ago learned that “the wages of sin is death,” but we should note that it is the loss and not the curse that is bothering men in their efforts for material gain. We do not deny that some good is achieved (as man sees it) when such things are abolished; but the citadel of sin is unassailed! Sober infidels go to hell as well as drunken ones. While we are glad for everything that is right, let us ever be alert lest this specious form of work righteousness hoodwink us into believing that it is the cure!

We must also at this time declare ourselves on the question of “social service,” because it is the question of the hour. The reasons are not hard to find. The whole



world is at present aroused by the fearful social injustice that prevails. The cry of the socialist, for you must give him the credit for this agitation, has at last been heard. Housecleaning after a thorough fashion is the order of the day. Churches with their pastors are being drawn in at a rapid rate. That it presents many alluring features and is doing good after its own way, no one will gainsay; nor will we deplore any wrong removed as a consequence of this effort. However, we maintain that any work that is done collectively by Jew, agnostic, and humanitarian, with every form of belief and unbelief, is not and cannot be specifically Christian. We can't expect them to set forth the Christ. That wrongs should be righted none will deny; that good is done all will admit. Our confessions speak of a third use of the law, so we would speak of the double use of the Christian. That Christians owe something to the State as citizens is self-evident. But when their highest ideal has been reached, the Christ is still missing. We know no cure out of Christ! Justice is confused with salvation. We will use a statement from Walther's "Pastorale" to illustrate, where he speaks of what the perfect sermon ought to be. It ought to be so constructed that any one coming to the Church for the first and only time would know that Jesus is the Saviour of mankind. Applying this test I ask, if this state of perfection were attained, would men know by the change that Jesus is the Saviour from sin? Social service, too, aims at the perfection and happiness of the race; but what sort of perfection and happiness is it? Better live in a world full of social injustice with the Christ proclaimed, if it has to be, than a Utopia that is without a Christ! Again we admit that good is done, and we can see how God will overrule it for good. We know that God can make even the wrath of man work out His glory. We are satisfied that right will eventually win, but the issue here is, what special course shall we pursue to be true to our specific calling? We think it is this, to follow our well-defined course, allowing no side issues, no matter how important, to swerve us from the clearly conceived purpose that God has in our own specific



field; fearful lest the same become involved with the issues of the times and that the spirit of the world usurp the controlling place in doing our work! Since its aim is reform not regeneration, since its purpose is correction not cure, since it is desirous to improve what man has done and not to take what God is ready to give and to do, we must never confuse it with our work. *Social injustice is a result not a cause.* Social obliquity is due to sin and we know of no cure then for it other than Christ. Though it is not pleasant to say, it is, we repeat, but a species of work righteousness and in so far diametrically opposite to God's plan as we conceive the truth. We can't allow any strange fire on God's altar.

We have looked without—now let us look within!

While a great many misunderstandings prevail from without about the work of the Church, it is just as true that a great many things are emphasized not at all, or not enough, within the Church. This is of concern to us. Among them, I think, none has been so overlooked as the doctrine of the "universal priesthood of believers," as it is so clearly stated in I Peter 2:9, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." Why is this? It is not within the province of this paper to discuss this subject from the standpoint of theology. Inner Mission is a practical matter and we wish to say that which, we believe, will be approved by all and therefore of common interest. We are in danger in our Lutheran system of being too idealistic, we are told; and it may be that observers from without can judge us and ours better than we can judge ourselves. I am satisfied that, from the theoretical point of view, all is as it ought to be with us, in a general way. We are free from sacerdotalism and the episcopacy craze; the form of government is in accordance with Lutheran ideals. We talk a lot about equality and not lording it over God's heritage, etc. and this is right! I fear with us the matter stands the other way! With us everything is put on the minister and he is lorded over! Yet, sometimes we do lord it



over the people, in spite of all talks about the rights of the congregation. Why? We do it sometimes because we lack men with qualification for leadership! Sometimes, I think, because we expect our laymen to be theologians! Be it as it may, I think all said and done, the doctrine is one sided with much for us to do to bring our people up to the true sense of their responsibility. The sense of its honor has been developed sufficiently. Glory is never a drug on the market. Of workmen there is a dearth. Priests have services to render as well as to be honored. It was so in the Old Testament; it is so with our High Priest in heaven at the present time, and it must be so in the church-life of today. The Book of Acts must come to its own and the possibilities of the diaconate, male and female, must be emphasized. There are certain services that the layman can not only perform, but which the pastor ought never to be asked to do! Are they doing it? A moment's thought will convince you that if our church life were properly developed this meeting would, in all probability, be in the hands of the laity and not of us ministers, for we are considering the work of the diaconate—the priesthood of service for the body! Is it not true that we have been expecting too little of them? And what do we expect? It generally consists of attendance at church, to contribute to the benevolent operations of the same, and to elect certain ones to the offices of deacon and elder, which officers very often have not the remotest conception of their honor and tasks; who know of their duties and powers almost nothing beyond the words used at their installation. Here is our great task! We must make the apostolic deacon a reality and not a fiction. The true return to the priesthood of tables will do more than anything else to drive the ice-cream table and oyster-supper out of the Church! When once we have aroused the consciences of our people to the fact that the work of the Christian Church is not confined to the pastor, elders, deacons or deaconess, that there is a place for each one of them as laymen, and that it is holy work unto the Lord, holy I say, not work-righteousness,

then we will have the dawning of a better day in the great development of congregational life.

Who can conceive what it will mean when we have a priesthood of believers who will believe they are priests of Christ and will work in accordance therewith? At present the average believer is in the vineyard, no doubt; but he is there to pluck grapes not to prune vines, bear burdens. When we stop to think of the vast deal of good that is done by the few who are interested, it staggers us to think what might be, with all the priests serving at their respective places. Let us bring before them their responsibility and help them to see their duty and privilege; always remembering that responsibility educates the moment it enlightens. The word gives us this right!

The charter rights of the priesthood springing from the Word, makes that Word again supreme,—as it should be. It therefore becomes us to guard sacredly the place of the preaching of the Word and the ministering of the sacraments. The chief place belongs to the spiritual. It must always be clearly understood that this ministry cannot supplant, neither can it be a substitute for the preached word. Many of our brethren still feel a little chary toward Inner Mission, fearing this very thing. We see on every hand the fatal effects of this work-righteousness spirit. That there is danger, we admit; but if it is firmly and clearly put under the Word, I think we are perfectly safe. That Word, we feel, is fully able to give the true perspective to the work, if we constantly emphasize the fact that all this must be done for Jesus' sake! That Jesus must shine as the bright, consummate star of the Scriptures, and that all else must cluster around him as the center of the system is the hope of our theology and the impulse of our service.

In the foregoing we mentioned the activity of individuals and their personal efforts. We all realize how much it means for them and for the Church; but we are dealing here with the Church which is the whole body of believers. We must distinguish between the services of the individual and the services of the Church. True, it will always



be the individual that will do the work, but he will do it from the congregational impulse and under the direction of the pastor. This is something different. Has the Church measured up to her task? That the Church, as a Church, has been woefully lacking in this matter is self-evident. One example will suffice. If Paul could write to a Timothy, "But if any provide not for his own and specially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel," then what about the Church? Shall the Church write such things to a member of the Church, and be guilty of the very selfsame thing herself? Yet this is true. Our orphans are in state homes; our indigent are cared for by the aliens; our diseased are looked after by the unbeliever; and our incurables are at the mercy of the world! This should not be! The Church has played infidel, harsh as it may sound! The very charge that Paul makes so distressingly black, is only deepened in its darkness when the Church supinely submits to this form of neglect. The Church as a Church must speak, not as individuals but as the entire body of Christian believers. This has not been done! Here we must make a confession of guilt. Let us not say that we need the world for this work! Some one has said, an excuse is an explanation for failure. Success explains itself!

In spite of what men say, the Church can get a hearing, and what is more, the world is ready to listen to our call. It seems many do not realize that the Church enjoys a unique position. Since it is not bound to any class or kind; for it espouses no form of politics; no code of social reform involving an economic program; no set form of governmental regulation, therefore it becomes, whether they admit it or not, the arbiter for all; the servant of all,—but the subject of none, when it exercises its full freedom and does its work as it should be done. But when it calls on the State for aid and uses its institutions; and seeks to make the State do work it cannot do, it prostitutes the high and holy calling of the priesthood of service that is its! The Philistine can then laugh at the Church shorn of all its glory and strength. We have



entered into an unholy alliance when we ask the unchristian State to do the work we are able to do and can reasonably be expected to do! We have sold out at a ridiculously low price, the beautiful wares of our faith. What is more, our members have a right to expect those services for the body that they now get from all manner of sources, such as the State, charity associations, lodges, orders, etc. May it not be, yea, we think it is more than likely, that if the Church had done its part, these would never have sprung up! Today, they who enter them are misled into the belief that they have all that the Christian Church has to give when they attend the services on Sunday! Leanness of soul results! This must be retrieved at all costs! This must be done for the sake of the souls who are deceived; for the sake of those who have so long been neglected; for the sake of the State which is honeycombed by "graft" in the name of charity; and lastly, because we have not honored the Christ, since we have not clothed the poor, fed the hungry, relieved the aged, nor cared for the orphan as we should. This, too, is patriotism of no mean order! Then we "fear God, honor the King, and love the brotherhood."

We are guilty, in my estimation, for much of this pseudo-charity that exists. By pseudo-charity, I mean, that form of giving that gives bread but puts the stone inside of it! That fills the fish with scorpions! We must, in season and out of season, declare that man cannot live by bread alone! However, we must never forget that Christ said, give ye them to eat! But more than that; we must not be guilty, as we have been in the Church, of saying, "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body," "what doth it profit?" If we are to speak of their pseudo-charity, then, alas, they are able to cast up to us pseudo-faith! There is still work for us to do!

As the great quadri-centennial is approaching, could there be a better slogan than this: "No Lutheran, an inmate of a state institution! Not a dollar of appropriation from the State to do our work of Christian love! Not a Lutheran uncared for!" Let that day come and



the Word will shine and be terrible like an army with banners, but its terror will inspire and its banners will win hosts! That day must come!

To hasten the day of greater things, we must concentrate upon an objective. That objective is to get more workers; and the center of emanation that lies closest at hand and offers the quickest assistance to the Church and the pastor is the church officer. We repeat, for emphasis' sake, a radical change must take place in the minds of the people as to the position and worth of the deacon and elder. In fact, this is true of all officers in Church, Sunday School and societies. They must be no longer handles but helpers. They must not confine themselves to the task of financing the Church, but go out into the highways and hedges seeking the lost and aiding the needy. Let us get away from the heresy that ministers alone must seek and help men. Let that day come and the mouths of the scoffers will be sealed forever on the subject of our other-worldliness. Eternally do they prate of this—because we have given them grounds for it!

There are a great many people who look on the Christian religion as a beautiful theory; and the followers thereof as a set of misled visionaries; whose hearts are right and whose heads are wrong! These persons are so impressed with the idea of earthly force and human strife, that they say the Christian life would be a nice thing if it only were possible! They must be disillusioned; and the way to do it is to show that the Church can work as well as sing; that it can serve man as well as God! That it knows not only of a heaven far away, but that it knows sin, its fruits, and the Saviour from sin; who starts heaven here and now! That other-worldliness this world needs; and it is our business to turn this world upside down and make it another world, even the world as Jesus would have it! But to do this, we must have a Church alive! Alive to the great salvation that is ours! Alive to the sin-destroying forces that are deceiving the world, with all that is in it! Alive to the fact that love grows by loving! That Christ is seeking to give expression of tenderness to the lost through those



who know what the love of Jesus is!—not only the preacher but the laymen as well. What joy awaits the layman when he learns to know that there is a ministry for him! That his religion is a vocation and not an avocation! That service is not something esoteric and belonging to a caste system, but the means whereby Christ wants to deepen his life and increase his faith as he serves for Jesus' sake! How far we are from this! We have been playing with the sand and losing the ocean. The Church has not used a tithe of her strength. The world can teach us a lesson.

The great conceptions that prevail in the modern industrial world are these three: efficiency, the saving of by-products and using the plant to its greatest capacity. Here the children of the world are wiser than the children of light! We have a perfect Niagara of strength and energy that makes nothing more than rainbows! I mean the great, unused power of the Christian laity. This is no time to ask, who is to blame? Let us try to right the wrong. It needs it sorely. The Church is divine, and no further proof is needed than the fact that it has done so much with so little judgment. "God is in the midst of her," or she would long since have ceased to exist! No business could succeed which would keep open one day and be closed for six, or use one-seventh of its strength; or have one man working and fifty enjoying themselves. Here as well as in many other things it is proper to say, "Yet I show unto you a more excellent way." But this will ever be so long as the pastor is alive and the Church dead. One live pastor is better than an entire congregation that is dead. But the Church ought not to be a cemetery. Who is the greatest in the leadership of the world? Not that man who does everything himself! The great merchant does not carry the mail to the post office; the great general does not dig the trench; though mailing and trenches are integral parts of the organizations. He puts men to work! He being all the more engaged because he must find work for others and direct the same. And he is greatest who gets



the most out of the unpromising! We must teach others how to do. A task that is not easy but blessed!

Inexperienced help is always vexatious; and the first impulse is to "do it yourself." It will then surely be done, and done the way you want it done. Lack of confidence in our workers has made us pay the penalty. This way is very shortsighted, though it seems very practical and wise. We forget that we were bunglers ourselves once, and it is surely true that practice makes perfect! No one reading the work of Paul can help but be impressed with the fact how he left congregations to themselves after a brief stay, letting them work out their own congregational salvation. Have we a trust sufficiently large and a faith sufficiently strong to do likewise? Let us sit at the feet of the mother. Here is the little girl anxious to help her. She wants to dry dishes, say. Now, mother can do it many times faster and many times better. But mother love knows that she can wait and endure the imperfection of her child. So she lets her dry them at the expense of time and thoroughness, but with the assurance that the child is being trained to service, and will become deft enough some day! So the pastors must take the layman. What if he does not do it as well as you do it? What if the matter is not so perfect? You are training a servant and a soul;—that is worth more than all the rest. All beginnings are bumbles but they can lead to something better; whereas unused energy is not even a bumble—it is an unused talent which God and man condemn. There are possibilities in effort but none in non-activity.

"Lord, teach us to pray," was the plea of the disciples. Can we not hear the mute appeal of the layman today, "Teach us how to work?" The first step, of necessity, is to show them that there is work to do; that God is no respecter of persons, and that the Holy Spirit guides laymen as well as pastors, and that the layman can work for the Lord too! The first step up from slavery is to gain the consciousness that we can be free. The idea that our layman can do something will be the beginning of their doing it. Let no man deceive himself, though,



it must be real work! Let me say here, that I fear for the average church society. We try outings, "stags," moving pictures, banquets, even descending to boxing matches and wrestling, thinking thereby to interest our men! When will we learn that these baits are taken once or twice and then lose their charm forever? Why is it that every few years a new movement, a new league, a new club must be organized? Soon the gamut of change will be run. Then, what? Again we ask, why this change? It is because there is nothing vital enough to grip them. Ephemeral things can enjoy but a transitory existence. Today we cater to their desires for pleasure and they sicken of our diet. Could we but give them the vision of service and a possibility of usefulness—mark you, not as individuals but as a Church, a congregation—then I think the feverishness for novelty would die and work of permanent worth would take its place. But the laymen are not perfect, by any means, either! We must not overlook a weakness of our American people. We have an all-abounding confidence in ourselves that we are equal to any task. Our business men, at least most of them, have come up from the ranks and are self-made, possessing native shrewdness and are hard-headed and resourceful. They have an idea that there is no situation that they can't handle. Many hold in utter contempt the very notion of training "to do good," as they call it. They know what is good when they see it! This conceit has been a most prolific source of false charity which beggars and others have not been slow to take advantage of to the full!

Such men are the ones that cry loudest for social service because it appears to do good. They don't stop to consider the elements of the worth or the ultimate object to be obtained. It is to be deplored that we must speak thus, but these are the facts of the case. The man who would not tolerate a bungler in business will become the dupe of the shallowest scheme on earth where charity is involved. This applies to pastors as well as laymen!

At the risk of tiring, we want to repeat the statement made above, that we must ever be alive to the co-ordina-



tion of the layman's effort so that the guiding hand of the pastor, though unseen, perhaps, is nevertheless always felt. To do so properly, the pastor must enlarge his ideas of the layman's worth in church work, and the layman must be shown the central position of the words, "preach, baptize, make disciples." He must differentiate in his own mind the essentials of the two orders of effort that strive for the one goal by making Christ all in all. This will secure order and proper procedure.

Not only must he co-ordinate, but the layman and his work must be subordinate for the reasons set down before. The soul must be ever before both. Sin's removal must be ever the objective. Christ must ever be the Saviour and giver of eternal life. Again, with Paul, we must say, "I count all things but dung for the glory of God." We fear not those who destroy the body, but him who leads to hell!

In every walk and calling of life it is becoming a necessity to have training for the highest usefulness. It is not to be expected that the spontaneous preacher who despises the seminary and will depend on the Holy Spirit, is going to shoot a very strong bolt in this busy and alert generation! If this training is required for the preacher and pastor, it is just as essential for the lay worker. This training should touch the heart and the head through technical training in the best and surest methods. Now some of the heart training is in the disposition and early bringing up. The works of the teacher and the preacher, are seedtime sowings, and though it may lie dormant for years, it is nevertheless being developed by the Holy Spirit. The head training is largely a matter of reading and study in things historical where the Wicherns and the Fliedners, etc., will be the models and inspiration. It will deal with the apparatus and those methods and principles that have been tried out in applying the word to the exigencies of life. In this sense we may say that head and technique are somewhat one. Though we must ever bear in mind the limitations of the mental endowment of each man over which none has control.

While we are ever ready to develop a strongly trained

class as the most efficient force, we are not blind to the fact that work can be done by the untrained. The eye that lovingly searches for service will soon find some humble thing to do which gives the inward satisfaction that the Master is using the light He has bestowed to help another. Blunders will be made, to be sure. But who has preached the perfect sermon with all our training? Therefore, the educational system ought to be brought into vogue in every possible way. Here the societies of our Church and the various occasions that arise where the pastor is called on to preach or speak are an opportunity. The sermonic effort ought to be made a telling force when the proper time arrives. We must stock our libraries with the works that will serve the untrained and the trained and thus make the untrained to become trained, perhaps somewhat unconsciously. But above all, the pastor must give tasks to do. The theory of swimming may be all right, but a stream and an effort will go better and farther than all book knowledge. The pastor who carries on his heart the needs of the congregation can find many such instances of a practical nature where the spirit of loving service will find a ready outlet for its love. Let us begin with the children, so that they will know that they are a part of the priesthood of mercy and relief.

As we view the enormous amount of work that stares us in the face, we are constrained to say, who is equal to this task? Can the pastor do it? Yes, and he must. The future will expect of the pastor more executive ability and less oratorical. It will need more heart and head work and less foot work. He will be more concerned in keeping others busy than himself, for the services rendered will relieve him only to make him keep them at work by his intimate knowledge of the need of the congregation. In the future it will be necessary that he know his people more than they know him! He will, if he is wise, direct his reading to the end that he may know of the efforts and successes of others. His aim in studying the needs of his people will make him a specialist and



the best informed man of the community. The care of souls will teach him the cure of souls.

While the major portion of the work will fall on him, he will need those good drill-sergeants, the deacon and deaconess, to train the great army of workers that will be enlisted in the services of loving mercy. The multiplied ministry is a certainty in every church that intends to grapple with this problem,—that means the entire Church at work serving the entire need of the entire congregation according to the entire Word of God. Thanks be to God that we are not alone in this! Thanks be to God that He, who made the promise to the Church, is sure to lend His divine guidance. If ever there was a time when the ministry was inviting, it is now! This is the day that will usher in a new era and a better age; and happy is the man whom God gives the vision of the wonderful possibilities of larger services. To be a “soldier of the common good” is a signal honor; to be a leader should fill us with joy and trembling and make all titles and all dignities that man can bestow pale into insignificance! For we are co-workers with God and assigned to the noble task of leading many into the kingdom of loving services all for Jesus’ sake!

*York, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

## I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

"*The New Interdenominationalism*" is ably discussed by Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony in *The American Journal of Theology* (Oct. 1916). This movement is not wholly an American product. Dissenting Churches in England have their fellowship in various leagues and unions. In Canada there are prospects of even organic union among several distinct denominations. In the United States efforts have been made in the same direction. The most complete expression of the new interdenominationalism in the whole world is the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America" having a constituency of thirty denominations with about eighteen million communicants.

The causes underlying the movement are the sense of international brotherhood, the progress of democracy, the new scholarship, the spirit of toleration, the felt need of a social gospel, the new scientific dogmatism, a new literature, an economic impulse and an undefinable "drift" toward a common center, inspired perchance by the Spirit of God.

The perils of centralization should be recognized in order that they may be avoided. There is first the danger that the place of the individual be lost, as it was in the Middle Ages. Organization is also a peril. In union there may be a real lack of unity. Other perils are those arising from geographical localization, from diffuseness, dissipation of responsibility, officialism and the assumption of duties and functions which belong properly to the individual denominations.

The advantages of closer union are manifold and manifest. The spirit of Christianity is that of brotherhood, and as long as the Churches stand aloof from one another they contradict a great fundamental idea. Schism is a sin. In its testimony against error and false religions



the Church should speak with one voice. Comity needs to be practiced in the actual work of the churches. "Unless the Christian Church can act more nearly as a unit than it has in the past, it will be sidetracked from human affairs and its influence will be regarded as negligible, even while men continue to revere the Christ."

As to the future, Dr. Anthony does not claim to be a prophet; but he is quite sure that the laity will be more in evidence, that "theology" will give way to "a philosophy of life" and that the old tests of orthodoxy will be discarded. The members of denominational families will gravitate toward each other. The polity will probably cause two great groups of denominations, one congregational and democratic, the other episcopal. None of the federations now extant seem to be final goals.

Interdenominational organizations, such as The Y. M. C. A., have sometimes been thought of as the final form or expression of organized Christianity, taking the place of the organized Church. With all their excellencies such organizations have at least three fatal defects as final forms: (1) They lack historic continuity—ordinances, ministry, traditions and the sacred associations of the Church. (2) They overemphasize service at the expense of worship. (3) They are partial in that they generally minister to only one sex or class.

One may confidently say that in the future Catholics and Protestants will discover a common fellowship.

In regard to the foregoing we would remark that whatever the prospects of a general union may be the first and foremost duty of Lutherans in America is to come closer together among themselves. If we have interpreted the signs of the times properly the federation of the Lutheran Churches will not be simply on the ground of "service" but first and chiefly on the ground of a common "faith." That theology will be displaced by "a philosophy of life" is as improbable as the displacement of science.

---

"The Lutheran Church in Holland" is described by Professor Pont of the University of Utrecht in an article



in the *Constructive Quarterly* (Oct. 1916). It has had a checkered history, resulting from racial, linguistic and political differences as well as from rationalistic tendencies, resulting finally in a division in 1791 which remains to this day. The older or original Church is known as the "Evangelical Lutheran," and the seceders as the "restored Evangelical Lutheran." The former can hardly be considered a Church, being without a confession, embracing unitarians and some congregations not requiring baptism. There is no real unity among the members or the congregations, the only bond being Lutheran traditions. The latter seems to be truly evangelical, with inner unity and measurable outward uniformity. It has a confession which must be subscribed by its ministers. Its government is democratic.

"Christian Internationalism," by Henry Q. Hodgkin of London, in *The Hibbert Journal* (Oct. 1916) is one of the many saner articles which the various reviews publish in these disturbed days. He prefaces his discussion by saying "Whatever view we may take of the causes of the present world conflict, our eyes turn with eager longing to the future when we may begin to build for something very far better. Much is being written about a world-state, a league of nations, a league to enforce peace, and so forth. . . . The politicians and statesmen recognize that a plan for peace will not suffice unless it is accompanied by a change of heart." The war necessarily will leave various attitudes of sentiment against war itself on the one hand and vengeance on the other. Base motives of cupidity are also aroused by the powerful influence of the business opportunities which are stimulated by war. The peace of the world must rest upon deeper foundations than those which mere force may seek to lay. The only lasting security must spring from the religious instincts of the human soul. Nothing short of this will carry us forward to a righteous and enduring peace.

The first thing to do is to extend to other nations the ideas of justice and equity which prevail in the individual State. There is a basal-faith in an underlying world-



order and in the existence of a moral sense in mankind. This is recognized and relied on by all local government. The extension of this to all nations must underlie a world-state, if it is ever to be realized. The *second* thing to be remembered and cultivated is the idea that the human race is a family, and not a group of units each with a different aim and destiny. The selfish and barbarous theories that the "fittest" alone are worthy to survive is the misapplication in a most superficial way of biological phraseology. The Kingdom of God is not a mere theological dogma. The day has come to emphasize the idea involved as the great compelling ideal to supply the motive which alone is adequate to draw together, in one common welding purpose, the best life of men and women in all races. The *third* idea involved is that the common interests of mankind demand the co-operation of all races, for each needs the other to supplement its individual deficiencies. "There is strength and weakness in each unit, and it is by the mixing of these units in friendly emulation that all may be able to give their best and to discover their highest good." The *fourth* foundation principle must be sought in our Lord's teaching concerning love. The selfish policies of the nations are self-destructive. This is illustrated in the present European situation, which has been brought about by the false teaching that human society rests, in the last resort on physical force.

---

Professor R. E. Gaines of Richmond College, has some very sensible things to say about "The Layman and His Church" in the *Review and Expositor* (Oct. 1916).

"If the Church is ever to go forward in a concerted and aggressive movement for the upbuilding of Christ's Kingdom, there must be far more serious and systematic attention given to education. A man will give something of his means to an enterprise on the recommendation of his friends; but he will not put his life into it without definite concrete knowledge. Our leaders who are themselves for the most part well informed take for granted entirely too much knowledge on the part of the great body

of Christians. For example, the Church is a co-operative enterprise, and they suppose this is too obvious to need any emphasis. But evidently there are good people who do not think of it as such. You see we grew up with the idea that the Church is a sort of bookkeeping arrangement for recording the names of candidates for heaven. That matter having been attended to we have gone on about our business. We employ a church clerk to do the recording and we employ a minister as an enlistment officer, and sometimes hire an evangelist to help him if he complains that he ought not to do it all by himself. Our laymen need to be shaken up and made to see that to be a passive member defeats the very objects of one's joining the Church. There are good people who actually persuade themselves that they can remain members of 'the dear old church' after they have moved away from it. What must church membership mean to such a man? It is a superstition, pure and simple, a rabbit-foot to keep the booger from catching him till he is safe in heaven."

"The Sunday School is just now presenting problems of the first magnitude in the organized adult department which has grown up so suddenly and which is trying to find itself. It has large possibilities for developing our laymen and relating them more vitally to the Church, but in some instances it seems to have been allowed to have almost the opposite effect. In some places these classes have been increased in a few months from a score to several hundred men. They cease to be groups for Bible study and become congregations for inspirational religious exercises conducted on lines so similar to the preaching service as practically to duplicate it. As one meeting follows the other immediately, and as the two together cover rather too long a time to be devoted to one form of activity, the result is that the second service loses the majority of the men who attend the first. Gradually, without anybody attending it or even anticipating it, they will be thought of more and more as two distinct groups; and then come the little rivalries and then the clashing of interests and the movement becomes a disorganizing force in the Church. Sometimes its whole name—Or-



ganized Adult Department—becomes singularly inappropriate. Its organization has reference only to increasing its size, swelling the list of passive adherents, thus increasing rather than meeting the need for organization; in the second place the Mellin's food diet which they have, and the fact that they wish merely to be fed and not to be led, is not very suggestive of adults; and sometimes there is little propriety in calling it a department of anything, as it is a law unto itself. The pastors who are laying hold of this great movement and turning it towards aggressive work for the Kingdom, are helping to solve the problem of how to give the layman a vital relation to his church."

"The Long Road to Freedom of Worship," by Dr. W. W. Everet, in *The Review and Expositor* (Oct. 1916), alludes to Thos. More and Luther as follows:

"But the Reformers were no better and no worse than Thomas More for they betrayed the liberty which they had at first defended. What nobler defense can be found than in the words of Luther? In the preface to the edition of the Letters of John Huss he says: 'The Papists burned the heretics because they were not able to answer their writings. If killing is confuting then the hangman is the best theologian.' Heresy is a spiritual thing, he said, which no iron can hew down, no fire can burn and no water can drown. One of Luther's Ninety-five Theses read, 'The burning of heretics is against the will of the Holy Spirit.' In 1520 he addressed Christian nobles with these words, 'We should conquer heretics with writings not with fire.' Two years later he exclaimed, 'I will preach, talk and write, but I will not violently force and compel any one, for faith is willing and unconstrained and must be received without compulsion.' In 1523, he demanded: 'What does the Elector count in religious matters? Why do we inquire of him? He has the say only in secular affairs. If he wished to take more we would say, Dear Sir, attend to your own department.' In 1524 he wrote, 'There must be sects. Let the minds of men clash together. If some are misled, that's the way in war. Some must fall wounded, but he who fights

honestly will be crowned. Let everyone teach and believe what he will, the truth or a lie; all the government can do is to prevent incitement to war and riot.' 'If you bid me believe and forbid me to read books, I will not obey. For then you are a tyrant and strike too high, commanding where you have neither right nor power. God's word must fight with heresy. If that fails secular power will fail even if it fills the world with blood.' As late as 1527, he wrote, 'It is not right and it is really grievous to me that the miserable Anabaptists are murdered and burned to death. Everyone should be allowed to believe what he will. Oppose them with writing and the word of God.' Luther remembered that he and his books had been condemned by the Diet of Worms to the flames."

---

In an article on "Archaeology and Biblical Research" in the *Methodist Review* (Nov. 1916), the following remarks are made concerning the language of the New Testament:

The recently discovered papyri and ostraca have shown conclusively that there is no justification for the old belief that the New Testament was written in a language peculiarly its own. On the other hand, the language is precisely the same as that spoken and written by the common people of the Mediterranean basin in the imperial age. It was the non-literary Greek, not the Greek of Plato and Demosthenes, but rather that of the working man, the traveler, and business life of the period.

Christ, no doubt, spoke Aramaic, and possibly Greek. The same will be true of the apostles. The New Testament—Matthew's Gospel excepted—was written in colloquial Greek or the language understood by the common people all along the Mediterranean coast. As Christianity was to be a world religion, it was necessary that the most cosmopolitan language of the age should be used in promulgating the new religion.

It has been aptly said that the New Testament is the best monument of late colloquial Greek. This greatest of all books makes no effort after elegance of diction or even



conformity to grammar and the canons of literature. This non-literary style, this colloquial Greek, the language of the shops and market-places, of the peasant and the fisherman, must have been the best adapted for the preaching of the gospel in the various great centers.

The learned expositors of the New Testament of the last century, misled by the grammarians and lexicographers, were fond of labeling a very large number of words as "biblical" or "peculiar to the New Testament and Apocrypha." There were at one time no fewer than 500 to 600 such words. Of these more than one hundred have been found in late classical Greek, and a still greater number on the papyri and ostraca of recent finds. So today, instead of five hundred or more "biblical or New Testament words" the number has been reduced to fifty or less. No doubt further investigation will reduce the number still more.

---

In the *Reformed Church Review* (Oct. 1916) Professor H. M. J. Klein discusses the "Reformation in Relation to the Modern Age." He traces the Reformation to the profound religious experience of Luther.

The proclamation of the experience of Luther of the direct contact of man's personality with God's personality was the foundation of the Reformation. From this idea of faith everything else followed as a corollary. If the sum of religion consisted in trust of the heart in God who had given himself to us in Christ as our Father, then there was swept away the whole idea of the mediation of the priesthood as essential to salvation. It was this mediatorial priesthood that enslaved Europe, that made the liberty of the Christian soul impossible, and that had stood for centuries as a barrier between the soul and its God. When the Reformers proclaimed the priesthood of all believers, they practically issued a religious Magna Charta. Luther's pamphlet on "Christian Liberty" is essentially a declaration of independence. Among other things he said that a Christian man is the most free man of all, subject to none. This reformation doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers was exceedingly far-

reaching in its effects, because it rejected once for all the artificial distinction between clergy and laity which had characterized the religious life of the Middle Ages. The Protestant principle is that laity and clergy alike have direct access to God through faith. As Luther puts it, "All men are worthy to appear before God, to pray for others, to teach each other the things that are of God." In the springtime of the Reformation, under the breath of this principle, everything that had a right freely to assert itself began to struggle forth into independent development. While the early Reformers had no other aim than to restore to the world a living faith in God, yet when they broke away from the shackles of Mediaevalism, the spirit of freedom was felt and vindicated in every sphere of life and the Christian man was made to feel that through his God he was an independent being who stood as a priest before God and as a king before the world.

In the same Review, Dr. Herman writes of "Prayer and Natural Law."

In the final analysis prayer is both possible and natural because God is a Person. Dr. Herman speaks as follows:

Hence the facts, mechanical and vital, not simply warrant but fairly compel the candid searcher of truth to assume that the final cause of the universe is a Person adequate to achieve the astonishing results which have been produced by means of the efficient causes known to us as natural laws—one whose ultimate purpose must be measured by his highest achievement, which is manhood as manifested by Jesus Christ. It is wholly unimportant to inquire what natural science has to say to this form of finalism, for as we have seen, final causes lie beyond the proper sphere of science. Yet it is interesting to observe that great scientists have not only abandoned the irrational materialism of the past generation but are no longer afraid or ashamed of a rational finalism. Long ago, Prof. Agassiz said: "I never make preparation for penetrating into some province of nature hitherto undiscovered without breathing a prayer to the Being who



hides His secrets from me only to allure me cautiously on to the unfolding of them." And more recently, in a presidential address before the British Association, Lord Salisbury said: "Overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie around us; and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living things depend on the One Everlasting Creator and Ruler." Such significant testimonies might be multiplied indefinitely.

---

"The Effect of the War on Christian Reunion" is the subject of an article by William J. H. Peter in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oct. 1916). He considers the attitude of the Roman Church to be hostile to any real union of Christendom. While it has modified some of its rigid practices and requirements in minor matters, two facts must be remembered: (1) No Roman doctrine of Trent has been denied. The instances which have occurred are omissions or evasions, for a purpose and for a time. (2) They occur in books intended for Protestants and are given grudgingly, and are merely adaptations to the Protestant state of mind, and knowledge, and reason. . . . It is vain to look to Rome as she is at present for any contribution to this problem of Christian unity. The war has done little, so far as Rome is concerned, except to reveal her weakness and powerlessness, and to hold up to ridicule her arrogant pretensions, her edicts and decrees.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

## II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

In the countless distresses that war has heaped upon the Germans they have turned for comfort and encouragement to their national heroes of all times. Martin Luther, in particular, has received more than usual attention in the popular religious prints during these dark years of untold suffering and sacrifice.

Luther's inspiring battle-hymn of the Reformation, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," is sung more often by the German soldiers, both Protestant and Catholic, than any other hymn. The preaching of the times abounds in references to Luther and in quotations from his works. Under the influence of the martial spirit of the day men delight to contemplate Luther's strong German consciousness, his dauntless courage in the face of grave danger, his unswerving loyalty to his cause, his heroic efforts against foreign domination in Germany, and his unceasing warfare against tyranny and wrong.

Luther's devotional writings are used in the personal devotions of the men at the front and in the consolations of the wounded and dying. Luther's reasoning about war is applied to the troubled conscience of many a soldier who has knowingly killed some of his fellowmen.

The emergencies of an unprecedented war, even more than the preparations for the quadricentennial celebration of the Reformation, have reminded the Germans of their rich heritage in Martin Luther and have converted the sixteenth century Reformer into a twentieth century Prophet of the German people. The names of the two great Germans are once more united, Luther as the savior of the Germans, and Bismarck as the savior of Germany.

This return of the popular mind to Luther has reflected itself abundantly in the religious press. One writer presents a series of articles on "The German Sword Consecrated by Luther." Another writes on "Lutherus Consolator" and by a narrative of his own personal experi-



ences among the wounded and dying shows how Luther's words and ideas can be applied to the spiritual needs of distressed souls and tender consciences. One paper presents a series of articles embodying lengthy excerpts from Luther's booklet of 1526, "Can a Soldier be a Christian?"

It is interesting to note how thoroughly Luther in his day discussed the many questions pertaining to war. He touched on some of the questions already in his writing of 1523, "Concerning the secular government, to what extent a person owes it obedience." Then the outbreak of the Peasants' War in 1525 compelled him to take a position and to set forth his views in energetic and unmistakable terms. First he expresses his ideas in his "Warning to Peace." Then he sends forth his severe pamphlet, "Against the murderous and rapacious gangs of peasants," which has been so roundly criticized in various quarters, and which he tried to justify in his "Letter concerning the severe little book against the peasants." But the most complete and thorough discussion of the questions pertaining to war he presents in the book of 1526 already mentioned, "Can a Soldier be a Christian?" Finally in 1529, when Germany was threatened with a war with the Turks, the Reformer raised his voice once more on this subject and published two writings entitled, "Concerning the war against the Turks," and "Military Sermon Against the Turks." Not only in the political events of his day but also in the quietistic views of the Anabaptists, the Bohemian Brethren, and other radical reformers, Luther had ample occasion to express his views on various aspects of war. And there is abundant evidence concerning his views on the subject, though it is not easy to gather his views into systematic form.

Julius Richter publishes a very illuminating series of three long articles on "Luther's Attitude Towards War." These articles are the more interesting and instructive because they were written several months before the outbreak of the present war and are therefore free from the prejudice and one-sidedness that naturally color the articles written under the storm and stress of war itself.

One of the writers even undertakes to set forth "Luther's Attitude towards the Turks." In view of Germany's alliance today with Turkey such a subject requires specially delicate treatment. And such it receives. The article shows that Luther's attitude towards the enemies of the Fatherland was one of consistent and abiding antagonism irrespective of the religious situation and the confessional struggles within the Empire. The moral of the article seems to be that ecclesiastical politics and theological controversy should never be permitted to divert attention from a united defense against the foes of country and king.

The war among the nations has raised many problems of practical religious import. The Germans take delight in turning to Luther for light upon their practical problems. The Reformer is made to speak on the most diverse topics and his reasoning is applied to the most modern questions. And thanks to the astounding versatility of the man, his varied activities and his voluminous writings, the sixteenth century prophet has many a practical word to say to the warring Christian nations of the twentieth century.

The most noteworthy instance of this modern appeal to Luther is to be found in a series of seven articles from the pen of Professor Wilhelm Walther of Rostock. Professor Walther is recognized as the foremost living Luther scholar, the one most thoroughly acquainted with Luther's spirit and letter. The whole series of articles is entitled, "The Present War and Doctor Luther." Luther is made to speak in clear terms on the following subjects: Is War Justifiable?, War that is Just, The Assurance of Victory, Sacrifice in Times of War, Righteous Indignation, Prayer in War Times, and War that is Sinful. Let it suffice to consider here Luther's answer to the question whether war is ever justifiable in the eyes of a Christian.

When we ponder the untold sorrows and the innumerable sufferings that follow in the wake of war, when we pause to consider that these warring Christian nations have the express command of their Lord to "love one an-



other," it is impossible to avoid the question whether any Christian can with a clear conscience take part in such terrible procedures, and whether it is not the duty of every Christian to maintain peace at any price. Luther in his day felt the force of such questions and he answered them in unmistakable tones.

The right must be maintained. The Lord loves the right (Psalm 37:28). And where righteousness and justice are imperilled it is the sacred duty of the individual to fight for the right, and that, too, without regard to his own advantage or disadvantage. But the question arises, *why* does the Lord love the right and what is the ultimate ground on which the individual must fight for the right? Is there not a higher ground than abstract righteousness, a higher motive to justify the struggle for the right and to determine and define that struggle? Luther answers in the affirmative.

The ultimate ground of right and the highest motive for righteous zeal Luther finds in love. The numerous individual precepts of Holy Writ are to be understood simply as examples and incidents of the one supreme command of love. "All that God commands and desires is love." "All the works of the law are enjoined, not merely in order that they themselves may be done, but in order that man may manifest the love that is in his heart." What is contrary to love is contrary to God's will, even though it may seem to be in accord with God's Word. What love demands is in accord with God's will, even though it may seem to be contrary to the words of the Bible. And when love demands that a man fight for the right, it becomes his sacred duty so to fight. Only when Christian love is the impelling motive can a man's fight for the right be called a Christian fight. No Christian can regard any war as justifiable unless it is understood to be a duty imposed by love. But when so understood it is not only justifiable, it is a sacred duty.

Here are Luther's own words for it: "What else is war than the punishment of wrong and evil? Why does a person go to war except to secure peace and obedience. Although it may not appear to the superficial view that

killing and robbing is a work of love appropriate to Christian hands, nevertheless in reality it is a work of love. For example, a good physician may find a disease so virulent and widespread that he must cut off a hand, a foot, an ear, or an eye, in order to save the whole body. If one should regard only the member that is cut off, the physician might seem to be an atrocious, merciless man. But if one regards the body that he has saved, it is clear that the physician is a true and faithful man and has performed a good Christian deed. Likewise, if I think of war, how it punishes the wicked, kills the unjust, and causes all manner of misery, I may be disposed to regard it as a most unchristian work and quite contrary to Christian love. But if I consider how it protects the good, preserves and defends wife and child, house and home, goods and honor and peace, then I see how precious and divine a work it is and I observe that it is nothing more than the amputation of a leg or a hand in order that the entire body may not be destroyed. For if the sword did not defend us and preserve the peace everything in the world would be lost in turmoil. Therefore we may say that war is nothing but a short lapse of the peace which preserves us against eternal and endless turmoil, nothing but a small misfortune which spares us the necessity of an infinitely greater misfortune."

It is greatly to be regretted, says Luther, that such terrible measures as war involves cannot be avoided. But it grows out of the deep sinfulness of the human race.

Luther's idea then, is that war is a necessary evil, a sharp instrument wielded by a hand of love in order to preserve the human race against the much greater evil of complete bondage to the powers of wickedness. But such a justification of war may seem too weak to apply to such a cataclysm as that which at present convulses the world involving as it does the whole world's population and entailing horrors and miseries that cannot be conceived by the liveliest imagination. Nevertheless, Luther insists that his logic applies to war no matter how great the number of persons involved. The larger the number of those who oppose the right, the greater is the amount of



the evil that they will accomplish unless they are prevented by force. "If a thief or a murderer or an adulterer is punished, that is the punishment of a single evil-doer. But if a person goes to war for the sake of the right, i. e., under the dictates of love, he helps to punish at one stroke a whole big mass of evil-doers and thus helps to punish a so much greater offense against the right."

But Luther's analogy between the individual criminal and the masses in the army of the warring enemy does not hold in all particulars. The punishment, even the capital punishment, of the individual criminal we may regard with equanimity because we feel that he has received his individual deserts. But the terrible thing about war is that suffering and death are here visited upon multitudes of individuals who are personally innocent, multitudes of innocent in the army that is opposing the right and multitudes of innocent in the army that is defending the right. How are we to justify the operations of an instrument that lacerates and amputates not only the offending members of the human organism, but also the innocent and wholesome members? Luther perceived the difficulty and he met it.

In a sermon on Abraham's forcible rescue of Lot from the hands of the hostile kings Luther points out that we are all involved in a social organism from whose fortunes we cannot as individuals separate ourselves. We are involved in a community, innocent with guilty, just with unjust. We must share the misfortunes, even as we are privileged to share the fortunes, of those among whom our lot is cast. This is true of pestilence and plague, of famine and plenty, of adversity and prosperity, and it is true of war and peace. The wielding of the sword is not the only agency that brings agony and death upon innocent husbands and fathers and heaps woe and misery upon innocent widows and orphans. Even in the punishment of the individual criminal under civil law many of his innocent fellowmen may suffer. God has so ordered the universe and the human race that we are not only individuals but also parts of a complex whole. That is

why the sword of war strikes not only the originator of the war but the whole people. The amputation of a diseased member of the body may draw blood from the healthy members and even entail pain and weakness upon the whole body. It is part of the divine order and will.

Luther never lost sight of the fact that war is an evil and therefore wrong. It grows out of the perversity of human nature and the sinfulness of men. But God in his providence overrules it to His own glory. He turns the counsels of kings to His purposes, and the ragings of the nations He maketh to praise Him. In the face of actual war, therefore, we must learn to keep quiet and to bow submissively before the fact that God's hand is upon us. In a two-fold sense Luther saw God's will and hand in war. First, it is one of the means He employs to maintain righteousness among the nations. Second, it is one of the means He employs to visit discipline upon sinful humanity. With reference to the first, we must serve Him by drawing the sword. With reference to the second, it is our religious duty humbly to bear the terrible consequences of war.

Treitschke once ascribed to Luther a certain "idealism of war." Such an idealism, in the sense in which Moltke and Treitschke himself advocated it, cannot be found in Luther's thought or expression. The idea of these modern Germans is that war is good and useful to develop the noblest virtues of man. Moltke wrote that war is useful because it cultivates the qualities of "courage and self-denial, loyalty to duty and willingness to sacrifice"; and he maintained that "without wars the world would be completely lost in materialism and would become a veritable wilderness so far as morals are concerned." Luther's idea of war was somewhat different. It is true Luther spoke of war as "an element in God's plan for the universe." But in the foreground of Luther's reasoning on the subject always stood the idea that war is a necessary evil, a matter of discipline and woe (*Plage*). Nowhere does he say that war ennobles the warrior or advances the race. It is nothing but a bitter and inexorable necessity which the Christian must view



“with manly eyes.” There is such a thing as a righteous war on the part of a whole nation. And when an individual finds himself involved in war, whether his country is right or wrong, his duty to his neighbor demands that he should enter the conflict with a good conscience, should “commend his body and soul into God’s hands, draw his sword and strike in God’s name.”

These and a great many other things Luther said about the justification of war. It does not seem to have occurred to him to raise the question whether war might not be entirely prevented or abolished. Luther recognizes war as a terrible evil, but he does not come upon the thought that the world might get along very well without it. Christ’s ethical precept, “Resist not evil,” Luther binds very firmly upon the consciences of individual Christians. But he never goes on to apply the principles to the world as a whole with its struggles and its wars. It is clear that the great Reformer, despite the grand heights to which he often attained even on very practical subjects, nevertheless in his views on war was for the most part under the influence of the Augustinian and the mediaeval view of the world.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

*The Formula of Concord, Its Origin and Contents.* A Contribution to Symbolics by George J. Fritschel, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History at Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. Cloth. Pp. xii. 228 Price \$1.25.

Dr. Fritschel has treated his subject with scholarly thoroughness. He prepares the way to the consideration of the Formula itself by presenting first the Historical Origin of the Formula. Beginning with the status of Lutheran Germany after Luther's death, he traces the political, ecclesiastical and doctrinal conflicts which were waged for a third of a century. With historical fidelity he follows the several controversies, the final settlement of which is so ably expressed in the Formula. The historical setting of the Formula constitutes not only Part I, but is presented also in Part II, "The Formula of Concord Itself," in the historical introduction to each article. Nothing is left unsaid to explain and to clarify the occasion of its existence. This historical presentation and vindication of the Formula seems to be somewhat out of proportion to the discussion of the Formula itself.

The Formula is analyzed in the form of an outline giving the pros and cons in an intelligible way.

We commend Dr. Fritschel's book as an excellent introduction to the study of the Formula, one of the richest of the symbols of the Lutheran Church.

The Publication Society has issued the work in an attractive form.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Luther's Christmas Tree*, by Theophilus Stork, D.D., with Illustrations, reprinted after the original edition of 1855. Illuminated paper cover. Pp. 32. Price 10 cents.

This is a beautifully printed and well told Child's Life of Luther. The late Dr. Stork was a gifted writer, and in *Luther's Christmas Tree* he makes Luther live again. In this Reformation year, when we celebrate the 400th Anniversary of the Reformation thousands of copies of



the "Christmas Tree" should be circulated. The life of Luther shows us how the peasant lived long ago, and how he struggled for an education and for the light and comfort of the Gospel. His experiences have been blessed of God to be a help to thousands. A new era of Luther's usefulness is opening at this time.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Challenge of the Sunday School.* By Charles P. Wiles, D.D. Pp. 185. Price \$1.00 net.

The author of this volume is well and most favorably known throughout the General Synod as the editor of our Publication Society and especially of our Sunday School literature. About a year ago he visited the theological seminaries of the General Synod by appointment of the Board of Publication and delivered in each a series of lectures on the history, development and work of the Sunday School. These lectures have been revised and enlarged and are now given to the public in this excellent volume. Dr. Wiles has done well to publish them. His book makes a valuable addition to our Sunday School literature. It is especially valuable because it comes from a Lutheran source and is thoroughly Lutheran in its teaching.

The volume is divided into five principal parts: The History of the Sunday School; The Place of the Sunday School; The Importance of the Sunday School; The Aim of the Sunday School; and The Efficiency of the Sunday School. This furnishes a comprehensive survey of the whole subject, and it would be difficult to raise any important question that is not adequately discussed.

The author shows remarkable restraint and balance, also, in the discussion of his subject. Most writers as experts on subjects to which they have given much time and study, and in which they have become deeply interested, lose all sense of proportion. They make extravagant claims for their particular line of work, and try to push everything else into the background. There is nothing of this in Dr. Wiles' book. He, of course, stresses the importance of the Sunday School in the work of the Church, and especially in the nurture of the youth of the Church. But he makes no undue claims for it, neither does he belittle any other legitimate work by contrast. Especially does he recognize the place and importance of the Church itself, and of its regular services, as the divinely appointed means for the salvation of men, and for



the training of them in Christian truth and in righteousness.

Dr. Wiles deserves praise also for his loyalty to the Lutheran faith and cultus. There is of course no bigotry. No one who knows Dr. Wiles would suspect him of this. But always he writes as a Lutheran for Lutherans. This may somewhat restrict the sale of the book, but it makes it all the more valuable for Lutherans. Many books on the Sunday School and on Sunday School work are written from a standpoint that is positively hostile to our Lutheran conception of the Christian nurture of children, or are so colorless on this subject, that they are either useless to our people, or actually misleading and injurious. It is good, therefore, to pick up a book like this which is written frankly and distinctly from the Lutheran standpoint. We have in mind especially those parts of the book which treat of the attitude that should be taken by the Sunday School towards the baptized children of the Church.

No pains have been spared by the Publication House in the mechanical work on this volume. The paper, the type and the press work are all of the very best, and the binding is well done in a strong and artistic cover. The book should have a large sale. It should be read by every pastor and Sunday School superintendent, and especially by every Sunday School teacher in the Lutheran Church.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLICATION HOUSE. PHILADELPHIA.

*Life of Adolph Spaeth, D.D., LL.D., 1839-1910.* Told in his own Reminiscences, his Letters and the Recollection of his Family and Friends. Edited by his wife. Sixteen Illustrations. Cloth. Pp. 439.

The biography of the late Dr. Spaeth is a most interesting and well-told life story of one of the most noted and most gifted of our Lutheran clergy. It is a charming book in contents and composition, well worth perusal by all who admire a man of strong personality. Dr. Spaeth came to America from Europe toward the close of the Civil War in 1864, and became an ardent American, who however never lost his love for the Fatherland. He was cosmopolitan in his experiences. Born in Germany, he spent a year in Italy and two in Scotland before coming to America. He was educated in one of the so-called lower seminaries of Wuerttemberg and the University of Tübingen. He was a man of the greatest versatility—poet, musician, author, professor and



preacher. His industry was indefatigable. The churches which he served in Philadelphia, the Lutheran Seminary in which he was for many years professor, and the Deaconess House and Mary J. Drexel Home with which he was so closely identified from their foundation—all bear the marks of his counsels and labors.

His domestic relations were most lovely. He came from a good family, all whose members were people of fine character and unusual ability. He was twice happily married. His first wife was a daughter of Dr. John Duncan, a distinguished Scotch Presbyterian minister; and his second wife, the daughter of the late Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, the first Dean of the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. BOSTON, MASS.

*Bible Stories to Read and Tell*, with References to the Old and New Testaments. Selected and Arranged by Frances Jenkins Olcott. Illustrations by Willy Pogany. Cloth. Illuminated Cover. Pp. 486. Price \$2.00 net.

These stories from the Old Testament in the language of the King James version are not intended as substitutes for the Bible itself, but rather as an incentive to its perusal. Here and there a word is omitted or that from another version is substituted in the interest of clearness, but these changes in no sense mar the beauty and majesty of the old version. A celebrated Hungarian artist has furnished the illustrations, which are printed in colors. The value of such a book is very great. It will be welcomed by parents as a gift book for the older children and as a book from which to read to the younger. Faithfully used it will minister to religion and to culture. In later years many who have heard or read these stories will rise and call their parents blessed for the enjoyment, the information and the inspiration which enriched their youthful minds.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Challenge of the Future*, A Study in American Foreign Policy, by Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., Professor of History in Washington University, St. Louis, Author of "Pan-Germanism," "Pan-Americanism," etc., etc. Cloth. Pp. 350. Price \$1.75 net.

This book deals with the great problems pertaining to the future of the United States. Its statements and



prognostications are somewhat disquieting to those of us who have comforted ourselves with the idea that our country has nothing worse to fear than its politicians. Perhaps after all they are the chief source of danger in not properly estimating our present and future relations to the other great world-powers.

The author shows that the present European war is simply a phase of a natural and inevitable economic struggle. He does not believe that war can ever in the long run change the workings of the great fundamental law of supply and demand. The war of the American Revolution and that of 1812 were really only nominal victories for the United States for they left us poorer in trade and in the power of commanding foreign markets than before.

The period of American isolation is at an end. If America would have aught to say in the decisions of international questions, it must have an intelligent comprehension of them and of the compromises which are involved, and must have the physical ability to sustain its opinions. We have few trained diplomats and all of them are subject to the political whims of the dominant party. Our army and navy are out of all proportion to our needs and utterly inadequate to cope with any one of the several foreign nations.

We cannot, even if we would, preserve isolation. We are not independent in the true sense of the word. We are a debtor nation. In spite of recent changes, the United States still owes billions of dollars to foreign investors. Our inability, after the war, to maintain our present temporary commercial supremacy, must be patent to all who know the capacity of Germany and England to undersell us in the markets of the world. This means inability to earn dividends on foreign capital, loss of trade, with incident poverty and attendant evils.

The United States, our author believes, can not be subjugated by a foreign power, but may readily be invaded by England Germany or Japan, and made to pay a frightful levy. This is not only a possibility, but under certain contingencies may become actual. The only remedy for such a contingency lies in giving up all pretensions to regulate the course of economic progress in other lands, or to ally ourselves with a superior power or to do both. Should we seek, for instance, to check the economic expansion of Japan in Korea or China, our protests would go for naught unless we could enforce them by power of arms. This we are not prepared to do. Any attempt to do this at present would mean the loss of



the Philippines. The second alternative—to form an alliance with a great power—is the only feasible solution. The author thinks that only by forming an alliance with Great Britain can the United States preserve its present status. This opinion is not based on prejudices against Germany, but on the fact that England is and for some time will continue to be mistress of the sea. We must give up the Monroe Doctrine as far as it applies to South America. We must apply it rigidly to the regions adjacent to and north of the Panama Canal, which we must protect at all hazards. We must police Central America and Mexico, and bring them into harmony with our American ideals and finally absorb them. We must concede the control of the Atlantic to the British and that of the Pacific to the Japanese.

All this involves a measure of military preparedness far beyond our present condition. A thoroughly equipped and drilled standing army of about half a million soldiers and a navy of at least double its present size will be necessary. Technical knowledge and skill must be demanded, graft abated, and leadership developed. These things require much time and patience, and therefore not a day should be lost in securing experts to map out and begin systematic work. Civilians should not be permitted to head the great departments upon whose efficiency our future must largely depend.

Such in brief is the program outlined by a thorough student of the present world situation. It will be well for us to ponder what he has submitted.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Mythology of All Races*, in Thirteen Volumes, Louis Herbert Gray, A.M., Ph.D., editor, George Toot Moore, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor. *Oceanic*, by Roland B. Dixon, Ph.D., Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University. Volume ix. Cloth. Pp. xv. 364. Illustrated.

The present volume is the third of the series to appear. It sustains the high character of its predecessors as reviewed in a previous issue of the *QUARTERLY*. The myths and tales in this volume have been gathered from all parts of Oceanica, embracing all island areas, great or small, from the Easter Island to Sumatra, and from Hawaii to New Zealand. This great region is subdivided by the author into five sections: Polynesia, Melanesia, Indonesia, Micronesia, and Australia with Tasmania. The natural features of this area are hardly more diver-



sified than the characteristics of the inhabitants. The volume before us presents not only the more important types of myths but calls attention also to the resemblances and similarities existing between the myth-incidents of one area and another. There is no attempt however, at rationalizing these myths, or explaining that one is lunar and another solar. The author is very reserved in his conclusions, holding that in the present state of knowledge dogmatism is not allowable.

We find the ancient world-wide myths concerning the creation and the deluge, and also unmistakable traces of the Grecian mythology. There are numerous folk-lore tales and trickster tales resembling the Br'er Rabbit stories of the negro. All these make interesting reading and reveal characteristics common to all races.

The more philosophical myths concerning the origin of the world and man point to some original source whence they emanated and were modified as they were borne here and there by tides of emigration. Whether the Hebrew prophets drew from the original sources or purified ancient traditions is immaterial; but it is certain that their cosmogony is infinitely superior to that of all other races.

These volumes on Mythology constitute a unique and valuable addition to any library.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

WARTBURG PRESS. WAVERLY, IOWA.

*R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D.* A Character Sketch, An Appreciation, A Tribute. By G. H. Gerberding, D.D., LL.D. Paper. Pp. 141. Illustrated.

This is a beautifully printed and well illustrated booklet, commemorating the life, character and services of the late President of the Chicago Theological Seminary. In the estimate of his friend and co-laborer, Dr. Weidner had all the elements of true greatness. His native ability, enthusiasm, industry and scholarship fitted him for his task as administrator, teacher and author. Though a man of fine physique, his ambition exceeded his physical endurance, causing a serious break-down at the age of fifty-four. After about ten years of brave resistance in continued labor he finally succumbed. His monument is in the hearts of his pupils; his memorial in the Seminary at Maywood.

J. A. SINGMASTER.



THE ABINGDON PRESS. 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY.

*The Man of Power: A Series of Studies in Christian Efficiency.* By Lynn Harold Hough. 16mo. Pp. 140. Price 75 cents net.

Professor Hough is getting quite a list of books to his credit. Among those preceding this one are "The Men of the Gospels," "The Lure of Books," "Athanasius: the Hero," "The Theology of a Preacher," "The Quest for Wonder," and "The Valley of Decision."

Most of these are small books like the one now under review. But they are all worth-while books. They are all well written, in a strong and vivid style that grips the reader and holds his interest and his attention from beginning to end. They are not only interesting, but they are helpful. They leave the reader with a firmer hold on the truth and stimulate to a living faith and an earnest life.

In this volume on "The Man of Power," the discussion revolves around the much used, and sometimes much abused, word "efficiency." There are twelve chapters and each one presents some phase of efficiency. We have, for example, "Inner Efficiency," "Efficiency in Expression," "The Efficient Mind," "The Efficient Conscience," "Emotional Efficiency," "The Efficient Will," &c. Two of the most striking chapters are on "The Efficient Churchman," and "The Efficient Citizen." The final chapter is on "Complete Efficiency." It is full of stimulating thought set forth in a very striking and stimulating way.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Modern Messages from Great Hymns.* By Robert Elmer Smith. Introduction by Bishop James W. Bashford. 12mo. (5½ x 8). Pp. 283. Binding, cloth with gilt top. Price \$1.25 net.

This is one of the most delightful books that have come into our hands for a long time both in its contents and in its make-up. It is a splendid specimen of the book-maker's art. The paper is of the best quality, the type is large and clear, the press work is perfect, and the binding exquisite. We cannot help wondering how, with the present high price of paper and labor, such a book can be put out to be sold for \$1.25.

But of course, as with every really good book, the chief value of this one is found in its contents. Twelve of the



finest, as well as best known and most loved hymns in the English language are taken up for discussion in a very interesting and suggestive way. We must give the list. It is like a brilliant constellation made up of glowing stars, every one of them of the first magnitude. Just note them: "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," by Charles Wesley; "Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus," by George Duffield, Jr.; "Some Day the Silver Cord Will Break," by Fanny Crosby; "God Moves in a Mysterious Way," by William Cowper; "Nearer My God to Thee," by Sarah F. Adams; "Majestic Sweetness Sits Enthroned," by Samuel Stennett; "Faith of Our Fathers," by Frederick W. Faber; "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty," by Reginald Heber; "Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me," by Augustus M. Toplady; "Lead Kindly Light," by John Henry Newman; "Onward, Christian Soldiers," by Sabine Baring-Gould; "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," by Edward Peronet. It would not be easy to pick out another such a dozen hymns as this.

We suspect that the "Messages" from these hymns were originally delivered as sermons, or perhaps Sunday evening addresses. If this were the case it detracts nothing from their interest or value. Rather does it enhance them. At any rate the human touch is strong in them, and the human interest deep and keen. It might be said that these hymns do not need interpretation. They carry their messages on the surface and no one can miss them. Certainly, they have brought comfort, and help, and strength to multitudes of God's children, and they have been to other multitudes the vehicles for the expression of their deepest emotions and their loftiest aspirations. But, at the same time, we are persuaded that the reading of this volume will make them both more meaningful and more helpful.

The author shows a deep insight in his interpretation of the hymns, and also a rare knowledge of human nature in his illustration and enforcement of their "messages." We are not surprised at the testimony which Bishop Bashford quotes from the lips of Fanny Crosby. He says that when Dr. Smith's "Message" from her hymn, "Some Day the Silver Cord Will Break," was read to her, her face lighted up and she exclaimed: "Mr. Smith has expressed the very thoughts I had in mind, and I am glad I have a kindred spirit. You can read my inmost thoughts in his unfolding of my hymn." Neither are we surprised at this testimony from one who heard at least some of the "Messages" delivered: "By a simple and clear style, a copious store of illustration, and, above



all, a vision of the Master's face in every Message, he causes these jewels of the Church catholic to shine with a new luster."

We commend this volume to all for private devotional reading. We especially commend it to pastors for reading and study. It will furnish them with a great deal of very rich and suggestive illustrative material, and may suggest a similar treatment of other hymns for pulpit use, which might prove most acceptable and profitable to their hearers.

It should be added that each hymn is illustrated with a fine full-page engraving.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Undiscovered Country*, Studies in the Christian Doctrine of an Intermediate State between Death and the Consummation of the World. By George W. Osmund, Ph.D. Cloth. Pp. 339. Price \$1.25 net.

The persistence of Personality beyond the grave is well nigh a universal belief, taught in Scripture and in harmony with the teachings of science. That the soul will inevitably go to its "own place" can not be doubted. The nature of that place and the stages by which it is reached can be determined only by a careful study of divine revelation. Dr. Osmund has given an intelligent interpretation of biblical teaching, showing that between death and final destiny there is an Intermediate State. He traces the history of the doctrine from the Patristic period to the present, and finds its ground on the "Shadows and Glimmerings" of the Old Testament and more especially in "Christ's Fuller Revelation." The author discusses the Descent of Christ into Hades, but to our mind is not as clear and satisfactory on this point as he is on such questions as consciousness in the other world, probation, and heaven.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Foundations of Christian Belief*, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion. By Francis L. Strickland, Professor of Philosophy in the University of West Virginia. Cloth. Pp. 319. Size, crown 8vo. Price \$1.50 net.

The purpose of this volume is the discussion of some fundamental matters in the philosophy of religion, not from the standpoint of abstract speculation but from that of religious values. The treatment is not severely critical but constructive and in harmony with Christi-



anity. The general purpose of the philosophy of religion is the interpretation in a rational and systematic manner of religious experience. The author wastes no time in proving the existence of religion, the evidence of which is so patent. After briefly reviewing the various philosophical systems, and showing the untenableness of materialism, agnosticism and pantheism as world-views, he shows that Theism offers the only satisfactory explanation of the world and of its relation to the Infinite Personal Spirit. It is in the idea of Personality that the author finds the basis of religion, and the revelation of God. He demonstrates that the fundamentals of the Christian faith, such as the divinity of Christ, miracles, inspiration, are all defensible on the ground of rational experience. The book is a fine philosophical apologetic of Christianity.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

*The Gospel of Good Will as Revealed in Contemporary Scriptures.* By William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College. Cloth binding. Pp. 245.

This volume contains the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale School of Religion for 1916. We doubt, however, whether they will add much either to the reputation of the author, or to the value of this remarkable series of lectures. Certainly this volume is by no means equal, in our judgment, to either Horne's "The Romance of Preaching," or Pepper's "A Voice from the Crowd," the two immediately preceding.

And yet the book is unique in its way, and has many strong points. The whole conception of the lectures is unique and striking. First, the title is peculiar, "The Gospel of Good Will." The author himself recognizes this and rises to explain in the preface. He asks the question: "Why the Gospel of Good Will? Why not the Gospel of God; the Gospel of Christ; or the Gospel of the Spirit?" His answer is: "Because for many of us God is a far-off, forbidding being; Christ has become sentimental and external; the Spirit has come to stand for something vague and mystical."

A paragraph from the "Introduction" makes his viewpoint clearer, perhaps. He says: "We are passing through a revolution in religious thought. The old terms remain; but with new meanings and new emphasis. The old views had at least the merit of clearness. The



preacher knew precisely what to preach: and the layman knew how to put the preaching into practice. The new views have not yet become equally precise. Not every preacher who holds them knows how to make them clear to his congregation: and not every one in the congregation who hears them preached is quite clear about the manner of life for which they call."

This sounds like a complete departure from the old land-marks, and a surrender of the old faith in God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit. But the lecturer thinks not. He expresses the hope that in the end his hearers, or readers, will "find these personal terms defined and deepened, expanded and enriched." For, he continues, "Good Will is not an impersonal abstraction floating in empty air. It is the fundamental attribute of God; the essential nature of Christ; the characteristic quality of the Spirit: and whoever lives in Good Will thereby becomes a son or daughter of God, a brother or sister of Christ, a disciple and friend of the Spirit." But President Hyde is a pragmatist in philosophy, and a disciple and apostle of the Higher Criticism and the New Theology. He teaches in his last lecture that a man can be obedient to the "Gospel of Good Will," and therefore a Christian, without reading the Bible, or keeping the Sabbath, or going to church to worship, or using the sacraments, or praying, though he believes that all these may be helpful to him if properly used. As he sums it all up in next to the last paragraph, "A man who believes and lives this Gospel [of Good Will] whatever else he may believe or not believe, do or refrain from doing, is a Christian."

Another unique feature of the lectures, as also indicated in the general title, is that the underlying thought of each is taken, not from the Bible or from writers on Homiletics or Theology or Church History, but from contemporary secular literature. Thus the first lecture, on "Christ's Expectation of Men," is based on Jerome K. Jerome's "The Passing of the Third Floor Back," long extracts of which are quoted. The second lecture, on "Falling Short of Goodwill," or "The Meanness of Sin," is based on John Masefield's "The Everlasting Mercy," and "The Widow in the Bye Street." The third lecture, on "Restoration to Good Will: Repentance and Forgiveness," is based on the writings of Thomas Mott Osborne, the famous reformer of Sing Sing Prison. The fourth lecture, on "Good Will in Secular Vocations: Service," is based on a book by John Graham Brooks, "An American Citizen." The fifth one, on "The Cost of Good Will: Sacrifice," is based on "How Belgium Saved Europe," by



Charles Sarolea. The sixth, on "By-Products of Good Will: the Christian Virtues," is based on Kennedy's "The Servant in the House." The seventh, on "Good Will in Society: Reform," is based on two books by Jacob Riis, "The Making of an American," and "The Battle with the Slum." While the eighth and last lecture, on "Fellowship in Good Will: the Church," is based on Winston Churchill's "The Inside of the Cup."

We cannot take the space to show how each of these texts is utilized and applied to the work of preaching, and of practical Christian living. But that there are many very striking and suggestive passages goes without saying. President Hyde is a vigorous thinker and writer, and no thoughtful and wideawake preacher can read this volume without being helped, even though he may not agree with by any means all that he will find there. We have been especially impressed with the sanity and wisdom of the advice given in the lecture on "Good Will in Society: Reform." This is one of the danger points of the present day for the pulpit. Many preachers make shipwreck just here, by being too dogmatic and too partisan. President Hyde says: "There are usually two sides to a social question; and some truth on each side. There are two ways of taking each side: one that is right and one that is wrong. Ordinarily it is not the preacher's business to tell his people which side of a debatable social question they shall take: but to show them how to take whichever side they join in the right and not in the wrong way."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

SHERMAN, FRENCH & COMPANY. BOSTON, MASS.

*The Essentials of Religious Education.* By Charles William Heathcote, A.M., S.T.D. Pp. 290. Price \$1.50 net.

The author of this volume is a Lutheran minister. He has served churches in Chambersburg and in Philadelphia, Pa. For several years past he has been an instructor in Religious Education in the Theological Department of Temple University, Phila. Dr. Conwell, the President of Temple University, has written a brief introduction to the volume in which he says: "The author is not only a scholar and a skillful instructor; he is a direct benefactor. All books having the purpose combined with clear thinking bring the Bible nearer to the people and waken their desire to know its contents."



In the Preface the author states that the book is the outgrowth of his lectures given in the Temple University, and is published in response to the frequently repeated requests from his students and others interested in religious education. He further states that the volume is intended primarily as a text-book to be used in universities, colleges, and theological seminaries.

The first chapter is devoted to a discussion of "The Scope of Religious Education." This chapter appeared as an article in the October, 1916, number of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. The next four chapters, covering about 100 pages, present the history of religious education beginning with the early Egyptian, Chinese, and Babylonian periods, and coming down to the Raikes movement in England and the development of the modern Sunday, or Bible, School in this country.

The next section discusses the psychological side of the subject in five chapters, covering about 70 pages. There are five chapters in this part treating of "The Principles of Psychology," and the various periods of "Child Development," from early childhood to late adolescence. The remaining eight chapters are devoted to the practical side of the subject, the requisites for teaching, the training required, the organization of the Bible School, and the problems connected with its work and administration.

The author has brought together much interesting and valuable information on these several topics, and has made a useful contribution to a most important subject.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. NEW YORK, CHICAGO AND TORONTO.

*The Enchanted Universe; and Other Sermons.* By Frederick W. Shannon, Pastor of the Reformed Church-on-the-Heights, Brooklyn, New York. 12mo. Pp. 204. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Shannon is one of the best known, and one of the most popular and successful pastors in "the City of Churches." This is his third volume of sermons to be published. As in the case of the two former volumes, it takes its title from the first sermon in the series. There are twelve sermons in all. Some of the other titles are, "The Untroubled Heart," "The Higher Unity," "The One Touch More," "God's Use of Affliction," "The Final Candour," "The Shepherd God," &c.



Dr. Shannon's thought is clear, strong, lofty and inspiring. His style is epigrammatic and forceful. A good example of this is found in the introduction to the tenth sermon, on "The Final Candour." The text is Luke VIII:17, "For nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor anything secret, that shall not be known and come to light." The sermon opens thus: "This is our Lord's way of saying that we live in a transparent universe. Apparently just the opposite is true. So many curtains of enigma, rustlingly blown by the winds of mystery, tremble before our gaze, that we sometimes despair of discerning clarity, intention, purposefulness in the trend of things. The darkness seems deep and permanent while the light seems superficial and transient. The gloom is steadfast, the gleam is fitful; sin is glaringly triumphant, righteousness is modestly unassertive; disintegrating doubt is obstinate, constructive faith is difficult to practice. Is not this a familiar reading of the world? Unquestionably it is, and it is essentially untrue. For despite the apparent meaninglessness of life, there is a profound, universal, unceasingly active, shaping power that makes for order, for righteousness, for realization of the one increasing purpose which runs from everlasting to everlasting. In a word, Christ says that the principle of self-revelation is ingrained in the universe, in history, in things, in men. All are out on a campaign of ultimate, noon-clear publicity. There is a final candour at the heart of things. The hidden evil and the hidden goodness are alike marching toward manifestation. There can be no permanent secrets in a scheme of things whose genius is detection and publication."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

*The Lord God of Elijah.* By David Heagle, Ph.D., D.D.  
Pp. 68. Price 40 cents net.

The sub-title of this stirring little volume gives a better idea of its aim and contents than the title quoted above. It is "The True Biblical Doctrine of God as Opposed by Evolution." In the preface, or "Foreword," the author explains further that the essay is intended to "defend the exceedingly important doctrine of God's transcendence," and that it was originally prepared as an article for the series of pamphlets published for a time under the general title of "*Fundamentals*."

Dr. Heagle divides his discussion into three parts. In



the first part he treats of "the peculiar nature of Elijah's God," showing that He is a God "who can work miracles," who "can hear and answer prayer," and who "can assist us in all our needs and distresses," and who is therefore "the great transcendent God of the universe"; and also of the modern theories which are opposed to God's transcendence. Among the latter are included "the original doctrine of evolution," the "New Theology," the teaching of "Higher Criticism," the "philosophical notions" of men like John Fiske and Professor Bowne, and the various healing cults and other mysticisms. The second part, which is by far the most extensive, presents the proofs of God's transcendence. A third part deals with certain "corollaries" that follow from the doctrine of divine transcendence, such as that the God of the Bible is "a very different God from the God of all evolutionary theories," and that "evolution is not an authority in matters of religion," and that "the Bible alone can tell us about God and the great hereafter."

The book is well written, and the arguments are presented clearly and strongly. We doubt, however, whether they would be at all convincing for one who doubts or denies the transcendence of God, simply because he would deny or call in question the validity of the premises on which the arguments are based. But they will no doubt strengthen the faith, and help to relieve the fears, of many who may have been disturbed by the assaults of the opposing theories.

The book is beautifully printed and bound.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE ANTI-USURY LEAGUE. MILLERSBURG, OHIO.

*Usury: A Scriptural, Ethical and Economic View.* By Calvin Elliott. Pp. 300.

This is an interesting book. It is well written. But we fear that it is a case of "love's labor lost." The man who undertakes at this day to prove that not only the taking of usury, in the commonly accepted meaning of that word, but all taking of interest on loans, is unscriptural, unethical, and opposed to a sound economics, has a big task on his hands. Yet, this is the task which the author of this book has set for himself.

In his first chapter, on "Definition," the author quotes Blackstone as saying: "When money is lent on a contract to receive not only the principal sum again, but also an increase by way of compensation for the use, the increase



is called interest by those who think it lawful, and usury by those who do not." Mr. Elliott belongs to the latter class. He absolutely condemns all taking of interest, under any circumstances whatever. Hence he calls it all by the one name "usury."

The argument is based on the law of Moses which forbade the taking of usury, or interest, from any but strangers, on the denunciations of the prophets against the taking of usury, on the teachings of the Master and the practice of His disciples, also on Church history and the teaching of the early Church Fathers. The author claims also that the taking of interest is condemned by a sound ethical principle, by sound economics, and especially by its bad effects on character, both of the lender and the borrower, and by the oppression and enslavement of the poor which it makes not only possible but almost inevitable.

It would probably not be difficult to expose the fallacies in some of the arguments. For example, the fact that the law of Moses permitted the taking of interest from strangers, while forbidding it in transactions between fellow Hebrews, would seem to indicate that it was not regarded as inherently and essentially immoral in itself, but that its prohibition as between Hebrews was a matter of expediency and was a part of the general policy of restraint and restriction which was intended to keep them a separate people. No such distinction was ever recognized in connection with any of the Ten Commandments.

Then, again, the author's interpretation of the parable of the Pounds seems very forced and unnatural. His assumption, also, that the lender is always the favored one in making a loan is utterly untenable. The borrower is more frequently the beneficiary than the lender, and very often if not generally to a much greater extent. Why should he not be willing and be expected to pay something for the benefit? If a man can extend or increase his business and largely increase his profits by borrowing, why should not the lender benefit by this as well as the borrower?

These and many other similar questions arise in the reading of this book. But it is not our intention to attempt a reply to the arguments here. If any one assumes that the radical position taken by the author must of necessity be unsound and his arguments weak, let him read the book through and he will likely be surprised to find how strong a case is made out. He may not be con-



vinced, but he will be forced to think, and to think probably along new lines which had never occurred to him before.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

W. N. HARLEY. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*Little Journeys with Martin Luther.* By Brother John, of the Order of Poor Brethren, commonly known as Lutheran Pastors. Cloth bound. Pp. 354. Price \$1.50 postpaid.

The author of this book is a genius. He is a shrewd observer, has been a careful student of the history of the Lutheran Church in this country, has a keen sense of humor, and has developed "the art of putting things" to a high degree of perfection. He seeks to conceal his identity under the pseudonym "Brother John," but we suspect that the real author is the Rev. W. N. Harley, a member of the Joint Synod of Ohio, who publishes the book, and stands sponsor for it in a kind of explanatory preface, or introductory chapter. He states in this that the manuscript of the book came into his possession with a large number of other manuscripts, most of them sermons, as a literary legacy "from the pen of a deceased clergyman."

The scheme of the book is this. The writer represents himself as standing in front of the Luther statue in Washington one Lord's day evening in the middle of June in 1898. He was thinking of the great things that Luther had done, and of the mighty changes that had taken place since Luther's day. He then fell to wondering what Luther would think and say if he could come back to earth again. Suddenly he awakened to the fact that there were two Luthers on the pedestal, one of which presently descended to the ground and proceeded to enter the church nearby at the hour of evening service. Naturally he follows and keeps a sharp eye on the resurrected Reformer. After service he learns that it is Luther's desire to enter the active ministry of the Lutheran Church in this country, and that with this purpose in view he intends to apply for ordination to one of the several general bodies.

Filled with interest and curiosity the writer manages to attach himself to Luther as a traveling companion, and goes with him from one body to another until he has made the entire round of all the chief Lutheran bodies in the United States. First, he applies to the General Synod,



then to the United Synod in the South, next to the General Council, next to the German Iowa Synod, then to the Missouri Synod, and finally to the Joint Synod of Ohio. In each case a committee of representative men is appointed to hold a colloquy with the applicant who appears under the name of Brother Martin. In each case the colloquy ends either in the rejection of Brother Martin because he is suspected of unsoundness in the faith, or in Brother Martin himself leaving in disgust because he cannot agree with all the peculiar views of his examiners.

A chapter of the book is devoted to each of these colloquys, and each time another chapter is taken up with the account of Luther's journey from the place of one meeting to the place of the next succeeding meeting. It is from these chapters that the book gets its title: "Little Journeys with Martin Luther." On these journeys he comes into contact with all kinds of people and enters into conversation with them, sometimes into discussion and controversy, over all kinds of questions.

The whole narrative is written in a very bright and entertaining way. But the real interest of the story centers in the fact that the author, or rather the publisher, Rev. Harley, assures us that "in the entire volume there is not a single expression credited to Luther which cannot be found in any standard edition of his works." This is certainly a very remarkable statement in view of the wide range of subjects discussed, and the even wider range of thought and expression. It presents Luther as a truly myriad-minded man, and as being interested in about everything that interests men or concerns either their temporal or their eternal welfare.

The motive of the book is very well expressed by Mr. Harley in his introductory chapter, in which he assures us that "the author was a man of singularly sweet disposition and of mystic turn of mind," and then continues: "If, therefore, he had in mind any other subject than that of recounting a singular experience or relating an interesting story, it was only that which he tacitly avows at the close of the tale, where it is evident that he is under the impression that he has contributed his mite towards a real union of Lutheran forces by exhibiting, in a novel and striking manner, the folly, shame and sin of schism, discord and contention. If such was one of his objects from the outset, he has not gone wide of his mark in the execution of the plan. The folly and sin of schism and withal the foibles of bodies ecclesiastic, have been set forth in a telling and ludicrous manner. No matter how he intended it, he has dealt the devil of schism an effec-



tive blow with his pen. And for that we say, God bless his memory."

We are glad fully to endorse this statement by Mr. Harley. Perhaps he has not in all things been entirely fair in his treatment of the positions taken by the several bodies. It is very possible that in reading the book, the adherents of each synod, or general body, may feel that while the peculiarities and foibles of the other bodies have been very justly exposed and rebuked, his own body has been somewhat misrepresented, or at least its weaknesses exaggerated. This is only natural. But even if there should be some basis for this complaint, it is all done with such bubbling good humor that criticism is disarmed, and no offense can be taken.

We hope that this book may have a wide reading and that its lesson may be taken to heart by many in this quadri-centennial year. What a pity, what a shame, that our great Lutheran Church in this country is split up into so many separate bodies, in some cases at least actually antagonistic to each other. Not only is our unity thus destroyed, but our influence is weakened and our power for good greatly reduced. And why? Simply because none of us are as broad and catholic as was our great Luther. We have heard several readers of Mr. Harley's book say that they believed that it would not be a difficult task to write another book to show by exact quotations from Luther's works that he could feel perfectly at home in any one of the general bodies. This is probably true, and it would seem to be a more gracious task. We hope some one will undertake it. But even if he does, and succeeds as well as "Brother John" has done, the lesson will be the same, only coming from a different angle. It would only serve to give a new and stronger emphasis to "the folly and sin of schism."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

*The Books of the Pentateuch.* By Frederick Carl Eise-  
len. Pp. 350. Price \$1.50 net.

The influence of the critical spirit of our day is nowhere more evident than in the field of isagogics. Formerly isagogics included a somewhat extended range of subjects in connection with the form and contents of the several books of the Bible, such as archaeology, natural history, geography, as well as date and authorship. Now



the term is limited to the literary criticism of the books alone. A book on Biblical Introduction, we know in advance, deals only with that subject.

The Volume before us is the first of an Old Testament Introduction series of four, projected by the author, three to cover the three divisions of the Hebrew Old Testament, and one to deal with the Canon, the Hebrew text, etc. The author frankly avows his aim as being to set forth the findings of Criticism "in less technical or more popular language and style" than in such works as Driver's or Cornill's, the former of which he seems to accept as his standard of authority.

Prof. Eiselen has succeeded in his purpose to make a book within the comprehension of the average Bible reader. This is accomplished, in part by the author's devoting four chapters to a review of the arguments for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, so that the positions of Criticism are made intelligible by contrast, and also by his simple and untechnical style. The work is orderly and clear and sustains the author's reputation secured by his books on the Prophets. One cannot quarrel with so fair a champion. His temper and moderation will appear from the following summing-up with respect to the Book of the Covenant:

"There is, indeed, nothing in the laws it contains which would make it impossible to assign the code, aside from minor modifications, to the age of the Judges; and in all essentials it may go back to Mosaic decisions, which were adapted to later conditions and, when collected and codified, served as a legal guide until its place was taken by a more advanced code of laws."

But Prof. Eiselen has cast his lot with the Critics, i. e., he has accepted their premises, and their conclusions follow as a matter of course. When it is assumed that the lowest stage of religious manifestation in a people marks the beginning of their religious history, that statutes *follow* practice in the Bible as elsewhere, that a book is not a competent witness in its own behalf, the findings of Criticism are logical enough. But when a theory of the origin of the Pentateuch rests on the assertion that the prophets of the 8th century B. C., such as Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, show no influence of Deuteronomy (and certainly not of the Priest Code) it will not escape challenge. Amos shows such familiarity with the events as related in the Pentateuch, particularly Genesis and Exodus, and with the cultus of the Pentateuch, that for this, among other reasons, moderate critics like Eiselen and Driver, find it necessary to concede that "in its main stock the



legislation of P was not manufactured in the exile" (Dr. 10th ed., p. 143). If this is true, what becomes of Wellhausen's statement: "No trace of P can be found, but, on the other hand, there are clear indications of the ignorance of it?" And if this "main stock" appears in the history of Israel why may not the books of the Pentateuch as they stand represent substantially the manner of its appearance? Few conservative Bible students are so wooden as to make "Mosaic authorship" synonymous with "Mosaic penmanship"; but Mosaic authorship, in a broad sense, still best explains the Old Testament, as it stands, and the New Testament references to it. There are still those who credit the literature of revelation with being veracious.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

#### YEAR BOOKS.

*The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1917*, published jointly by the Publication Boards of the General Synod and of the General Council is a handsome paper-bound book of nearly three hundred pages, and sells at 25 cents per single copy. It is the finest and largest year book ever published by our Boards. It is issued under the auspices of the Joint Synod of Ohio, the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod in the South, and is compiled and edited by the Rev. W. M. Kopenhaver and Miss Grace M. Sheeleigh. It is filled with useful matter such as the usual calendar, a full directory of the church meetings, officers, boards, &c., a complete register of all Lutheran ministers, tables of Church Festivals with appropriate anthems, and also of Sunday School Lessons and Luther League Topics, Statistics, Rates of Postage, and thirty-four pages of reading matter chiefly of a historical character. Every Lutheran family should own this Year Book.

*Almanac for the Year 1917*, published by the Augustana Book Concern, 32 pages. This year book is full of information, especially for the members of the Augustana Synod, which has grown from 1860 to 1916, from 17 pastors, 36 congregations and 3,747 communicants to 706 pastors, 1207 congregations, and 187,578 communicants.

*Der Zionsbote Christlicher Volkskalender auf das Jahr 1917*, edited by Rev. Dr. R. Neumann and published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa, is a

beautiful Year Book in German. The first page of the cover is devoted to a fine picture of Luther, and there are a number of other illustrations scattered through its 160 pages. It contains much useful reading pertaining to Church activities as well as to the history of the Reformation, and to science, &c.

CHRISTIAN HERALD. NEW YORK.

*"Luther in the Light of Recent Research,"* a most remarkable book by Heinrich Boehmer of Marburg University; translated into English by Carl Huth of the University of Chicago was published last year in a handsome edition profusely illustrated, at \$1.50. It was issued by the Christian Herald, N. Y. Recently for the good it will accomplish, the New York Reformation Quadricentennary Committee has published a paper cover edition at the nominal price of 25 cents. A supply of this edition is kept at the headquarters and as long as the edition lasts, it will be furnished from the headquarters at 925 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. Postage is extra.



# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1917.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

BY PROFESSOR LUTHER A. FOX, D.D., LL.D.

The issues of the Sixteenth Century are not dead. The facts of sin and the need of salvation are living. The problems of the Reformers are still the problems of the world. The Roman Catholic Church, however modified in its methods and policies, remains a great and powerful organization. The Tridentine Confession is as much its statement of fundamental principles as it was at the time of its promulgation. The Augsburg Confession, the first of the Protestant Confessions, is as true and important as it was in 1530. There are new issues and new conditions, but the old are still vital, and while meeting the new we dare not surrender or even be indifferent to the old. It is a superficial, if not traitorous, conception of the facts that speaks sneeringly of the theology of the Middle Ages.

While Rome has remained true to its past, and in that sense is *semper idem*, yet it has created new issues. Among them are the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary and the Infallibility of the Pope. By the former Mary has been exalted so dangerously near to a place in the Godhead that Pius IX said that her requests of the Son are of the nature of com-

mands. By the latter the breach between the Protestant and the Roman Catholic Church has been made irreparable. Romanists can never repeal it and Protestants can never accept it. But so little is being said about it that we Protestants are in danger of forgetting it. It is a sleeping giant gathering strength and waiting for an opportunity to exert its tremendous power. It is a fundamental issue and it is dangerous to overlook it.

Papal Infallibility is a new dogma not quite fifty years old. It was promulgated by Pope Pius IX in 1870 with the Vatican Council consenting. It is not a decree of the Council, but of the Pope. An infallible Pope announces a fact that had belonged to the Roman See from the time of Peter, but had not been made until then a doctrine of faith. The deliberations of the Council were only preparatory to the Papal decree. It would have been just as valid if there had been no Council. The Pope steps out and asserts a principle that had been true during all the Christian ages. Neither the Pope nor the Council created the infallibility. They only became witnesses, and that in very different ways. Before 1870 it was treated as an opinion that might be questioned. Now it is a dogma that must be accepted upon the peril of eternal salvation. It may be retroactive as well as prospective. This is the decree: "Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition *received from the beginning of the Christian faith*, for the glory of God and our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the *sacred Council approving*, we teach and define that it is a *dogma divinely revealed*; that the *Roman Pontiff* when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is when in the discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith and morals, and that therefore *such definitions of the Roman Pontiff*



*are irreformable of themselves* and not from the consent of the Church. But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition let him be anathema.” Fourth Session Capt. 4. This was proclaimed at the last session of the Council while a terrific storm was raging and the lightning was flashing and the thunder was roaring in deafening peals, and the infallible Pope was reading it by the aid of a candle. The friends thought of Sinai; the opponents, of the day of judgment, already begun for the blasphemous Papacy.

This decree was the culmination of a long process of evolution. It had its root in the Roman exegesis of Matt. 16: “Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” It seemed to follow that the heir of Peter, who was the vicar of Christ and head of an infallible Church, must be infallible. There were other interpretations by accredited Fathers of the Church but as this suited best the ambitions of Rome it was the one adopted. But Rome was long in reaching that conclusion and establishing it by an irreversible decree. This development is not merely interesting as history but also illuminating as to the insidious and persistent methods of Rome in carrying out its policies. A much greater danger may lurk in this new dogma than most of us are willing to believe.

The doctrine of primacy without supremacy when it first appeared looked innocent enough. At the end of the Second Century there was a growing desire for the external unity of the Church. We see it in Irenaeus. In the middle of the next century Cyprian wrote a book on the subject and proposed the Church of Rome, “the cathedral of Peter, the principal church where the priestly unity has arisen,” as the external center. But Cyprian conceded no supremacy, but maintained the right of every bishop to manage the affairs of his own diocese according to his own principles. He wrote to Stephanus, the Roman bishop, as a colleague: “In virtue of our equal dignity and in unfeigned love we have informed you of these things.” On another occasion he said, “No one should make himself a bishop of bishops.” But Rome



forgetting all else never forgot the words, "Petri cathedra, ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." The question had been suggested by Cyprian as to the position of the Roman Church among the other churches, the place of the Roman bishop among the other bishops. It was discussed in provincial and general councils. Rome evidently guarded her own interests. While accepting the doctrinal decrees of some of the oecumenical councils she rejected those decrees of these councils that seemed to disparage her primacy and always recognized as authoritative those provincial synods that flattered and advanced her ambition. Gregory the Great, that truly great and good bishop, saw the tendency towards the claim of supremacy and was very much afraid of it. It was too manifest in men like Leo I to be overlooked. While Gregory insisted upon the primacy, and a sort of general guardianship, of the Roman See he stoutly protested when Eulogius, bishop of Constantinople, said that Gregory had "commanded." When Eulogius addressed him as Pope, Gregory knew that it was only complimentary, but he knew too that formalities might be construed literally, and he treated it seriously. "I know who you are and who I am, in dignity and rank you are my brother, in piety my father. I did not command you." He found the title of Pope offensive and wrote to Johannes of Constantinople that Christ is the only oecumenical bishop. Yet in the face of these historical facts Gregory is quoted by the infallible Pope in the decree that proclaimed his infallibility as supporting the claims of the supreme Pontiff to immediate jurisdiction over bishops, pastors and laity in all matters not only of faith and morals, but also those that pertain to discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. No facts are better authenticated but we are forbidden to believe them because the infallible Pope has spoken and our different interpretation of them has become a "private opinion."

The leaven of supremacy, fostered unintentionally by the fraternal letters of Gregory, was at work. Two hun-



dred years later it was openly asserted by Nicholas I. His claims were supported by the Pseudo-Decretals. He cited them and gave them authority in the Church. He expressly asserted that bishops were only his agents in governing the Church, and that the supreme power was in his own hands. The general and provincial councils merely furnished him information, and thus what he had a right to do by his individual authority, (*quod singulare pro auctoritate valet*) he frequently decided to decree by the advice of many priests. These Decretals, endorsed as it appears on its face as *ex cathedra* by an infallible Pope, are so manifestly fictitious that Roman scholars have been forced to admit that they were forgeries. They were patchwork, with some genuine decrees, with some mutilated, with some grossly perverted, with some amazing anachronisms, all so badly done that we are surprised that they could gain credence even in an uncritical age. But they were the product of the times, and supporting the general tendency to monarchism they found a ready acceptance. They gave currency to ideas that remained as powerful forces long after their source was discredited. In them are the germs of absolutism in both spiritual and secular matters which were developed in subsequent periods. Here we are warned against the beginning of evil no matter how harmless it may look.

During the next two centuries the Papacy passed through the most ignominious period of its history. It was the period into which the pornocracy fell. Children and the most degraded characters were made Popes. So disgraceful were the times that the fable of Joanna, a woman pope, gained circulation and was for some centuries an accepted story. In the civil world it was the age of Feudalism when "Knighthood was in flower." The kings were only nominal and the different countries mere geographical expressions. The feudal lords were the only political powers. All Europe was in a chaotic political condition. The Church maintained the form of an organization but it was powerless. The morals of the priests and people were horrible. Gregory VII came as

a reformer. The time was ripe for a great man with a keen sense of disorder, great constructive powers and indomitable courage to start a reconstructive movement. He was found in Hildebrand who against his will was made Pope. The Church seemed to be the only power capable of reorganizing society, and he held that it was its divine mission to be the imperial sovereign of the world. Gregory asserted his supremacy over both spiritual and temporal affairs not only in the Church but also among nations. He maintained that all spiritual and civil authority was derived from the Church at Rome and all ecclesiastical and civil offices were the instruments of Papal administration. The Pope, the head of the Roman Church, was the supreme ruler in the Church and State. The Pope had the power to change laws and make new ones by his own personal authority. He is teaching the doctrine of absolutism with the emphasis laid upon the supremacy of the spiritual power. But this new phase of supremacy had a long and difficult road to general acceptance. The subsequent dual Popes, the character of men like Julius II and Alexander VI and John XXIII, and the new prominence and power of General Councils delayed it many centuries. There were energetic protests even in the age of Gregory. Herman, bishop of Metz, pointed out the irregularity of Gregory's proceedings against Henry IV. Yves of Chatres admits that Pope Paschalis had done wrong and ought to be condemned, but Yves was still so much imbued with monarchism that he declined to sit in a council having judgment of the Pope. John of Lyons insinuates that Paschalis had been governed by heretical principles. Gottfried of Vendome announced his determination to renounce this Pope if he did not change his course. He told the Pope that a vicious Pope might be tolerated but not a heretical one, and that any man had the right to become his accuser. Peter of Cluny told Innocent II that a Pope must be governed by reason, and Bernard of Clairvaux said that Popes were to execute, not to make and annul laws. The Abbess Hildegard had little to say of the Pope but she plainly indicates that



she did not recognize his claims of supremacy over the individual conscience. Joachim is open in his attacks upon the Roman Church and calls it Babylon, and he condemns some of the Popes by name. All of these people who made their protests were in good standing in the Church and had a following large enough to protect them from prosecution. But more effective than any protests from individuals was the great check to absolutism given by the "Babylonian Captivity" as the Italians called the papal residence at Avignon, and the great Councils about the beginning of the Fifteenth Century.

Running along with this idea of supremacy in spiritual matters was that of supremacy in civil affairs. When the Pope got control of some Italian territory, he became a civil sovereign and got a place in the political world. That enabled him to enforce somewhat better his claims to temporal power based upon the nature of his spiritual authority. The donation of Constantine was a fiction but the Popes made good use of it. Gregory the Great promoted the idea of civil authority over kings by his letter of congratulation to Phocas when made Eastern Emperor. Secular Supremacy was given a great impulse forward when Pepin sought coronation from Stephen II and Charlemagne permitted himself to be crowned by Leo III. The idea of the combination of ecclesiastical and civil authority was by no means a new one in the time of Charlemagne. During the period of invasion when everything was thrown into confusion the bishops were the only competent rulers and the civil administration of the towns and cities fell into their hands by natural law. There are rescripts in the Theodosian and Justinian Codes by which this was authorized, and the practice was continued after the Empire had fallen. The line dividing the two kinds of authority became dim, and no one had that clear conception of the separate rights of the Church and the State that we have to-day. The bishops became feudal lords and had a double function, and during the feudal centuries the confusion of ideas was intensified. Otto I of Ger-

many, in order to counteract the power of the nobles, gave bishops fiefs and made them princes of the Empire, thus laying the foundation of the complications between the Emperor and the Popes in the time of Gregory VII. The way was open to the interference of Pope Nicholas I in the domestic affairs of Lothaire of Lorraine. Nicholas had asserted his supreme authority over both bishops and kings. He found the opportunity to put this claim into effect when Tuetberg, the neglected and abused wife of Lothaire, appealed to him for protection. The Lorraine clergy held a synod and declared the divorce valid. Nicholas, sustained by Charles the Bald and Louis, declared the synod null, and deposed the three arch-bishops and drove Lothaire to a temporary submission. The worthiness of the cause made the assumption of authority and the violation of episcopal rights seem justifiable, and the Papacy took a long step towards absolutism. It was primarily a moral question with which the Church might deal through the local authorities. It was also a civil question under the jurisdiction of the laws of the State. All this was overlooked and Nicholas afforded a precedent to subsequent Popes in superceding all local powers in dealing directly with sovereigns. Hadrian, of less personal force, was not quite as successful in carrying out the principles of absolutism. John VIII after he had crowned Charles the Bald as Emperor regained something of the lost prestige. Gregory VII two centuries later reasserted the secular supremacy in the clearest and boldest language. In the *Dictatus Papae*, which Baronius says was correctly attributed to him, there is a logical statement of the principles of the Papacy. In article one it is said that the "Roman Pontifex alone is rightfully called universal." In article twelve it is asserted that "To him it is permitted to depose emperors." In article twenty-two we have the doctrine of infallibility: "The Roman Church has never erred and will never, in perpetuum, err." In accordance with these principles he threatened to excommunicate Philip I of France, put his country under the interdict and to depose



him. "We wish openly that every one should know that with the assistance of God we will try by every means within our reach to wrest the kingdom of France from his hands." Soon after this conflict with Philip the famous contest with Henry IV of Germany came on. It began with the excommunication of five ecclesiastics, who were privy counsellors of Henry, on account of simony. These men were archbishops and bishops, and the charge was of serious immorality. It fell properly under the jurisdiction of the Pope. These men went so far as to excommunicate the Pope. Henry defended them. The Pope put him under ban and declared him incompetent to reign any longer. With true Papal instinct he plead the precedents of Zacharias in deposing the last of the effete Merovingians, and of Ambrose in excluding from the communion Theodosius on account of the Thessalonica massacre. The instances were dissimilar in essential features, but in all ages the remotest similarity is sufficient for infallible Popes who can change the facts of history to suit their wants. Henry had been unpopular at home and the fear of selfish sovereigns, who might be summoned to the support of the Pope, took him to Canossa but not to stay. The humiliation of the king awakened general sympathy and there was a reaction in his favor. The fall of Rudolph, the Pope's emperor, at Merseburg, left Henry in the undisputed possession of the throne until his death. The Pope pursued a different policy with William the Conqueror. When William continued, in spite of the Pope's injunctions, to invest prelates Gregory thought it better to remain silent. The contest between Gregory and Henry was transmitted under another form to their successors. It turned upon the right of the investiture of the prelatial princes. These princes were partly ecclesiastical and partly civil officers. Both Emperor and Pope claimed the right of confirming them. Through the dual functions of these bishop-lords the Church and the State were brought into frequent conflict. The loyalty of these men was divided. The question could have been easily settled by separating the

two offices but in that day of dominant feudalism that was not to be thought of, and there were wars and treaties one after the other for several generations. The Pope was continually meddling in civil affairs, enforcing his will by excommunications and calling upon other sovereigns to assist him. The sovereigns were also struggling with varying success to maintain their political independence. During this period the conflict between Innocent III and John of England stands out with special prominence. Gregory VII had declared the independence of the clergy of the civil laws. They were not answerable for any offense to any but ecclesiastical courts. This was the fight between Henry II and Thomas a Becket. It was of very great importance that the king should have an archbishop of Canterbury who was in accord with him. The archbishop elected in the time of John was not acceptable to the Pope who refused to confirm him and appointed Stephen Langton. The right of election was set aside and John refused to recognize the appointment. The rights of each is easily recognizable but the Pope in his absolutism excommunicated John, released the people from their oath of obedience to him and put the country under the edict. He gave Philip II of France the solemn charge to make war upon the rebel. Philip, who was very glad of the opportunity to seize John's possessions in France, showed himself a very humble servant of the Church. Innocent III succeeded in maintaining, without enlarging, the ground gained by Gregory. During the Thirteenth Century the contests were chiefly with the minor sovereigns. The Pope scored an important victory over Rudolph of Hapsburg, who acknowledged in a most humiliating manner the supremacy of the Pope. The Fourteenth Century opened in the midst of a most bitter contest between Philip the Fair of France and Boniface VIII. Boniface, as Cardinal Benedict Cajetan, by craftiness and shrewdness, induced his predecessor, Celestine V, to resign and had himself elected to the papal throne. As Pope he was avaricious, ambitious and revengeful. He was guilty of bold nepotism. In a letter to Philip he



wrote, "Thou art to know that in things spiritual and temporal thou art subject to us." To which Philip replied, "Let thy most consummate folly know that in temporals we are subject to no man." Boniface made his name immortal by his famous decree known as *Unam Sanctam* which is the boldest, clearest official assertion of absolutism that was ever made up to the time of the Vatican Council. It bears on its face the marks of an *ex cathedra* decree though some have questioned it. We may be certain that it will be so used whenever occasion calls for it. "There is only one Church. The Church, one body, cannot have two heads. The head is Christ, and Peter and his successors are the vicars of Christ. There are two swords, the spiritual and temporal. Both are in the Church. It is necessary that the temporal be under the spiritual (*gladium esse sub gladio*). If the temporal power goes astray (*deviat terrera potestas*) it is judged by the spiritual power and if the lesser spiritual powers err they are to be judged by their superiors, but if the supreme power, the Pope, errs he is to be judged by God alone. We affirm, declare, define and proclaim to every human being that obedience to the Roman Pontiff is necessary to salvation." The Popes did not have at command the power of carrying this principle of Papacy at once into effect. But the Popes during that century until near its close have large political influence. The kings of France wanted the papal seat on their own territory and Philip the Fair induced the crafty Clement V to locate at Avignon. From this retreat the Popes asserted with great arrogance papal supremacy but were compelled to suffer the humiliation of seeing these principles ignored in the very country of their adoption. It was the age of oppression and discontent, and of numerous protests against corruption and absolutism, as by Hegidius, John of Paris and Marsillius. Gregory XI in 1376 moved back to Rome. The election of Urban VI was somewhat irregular but would have been accepted if he had been less passionate, haughty and indiscreet. The French Cardinals, with some Italians, elected Clement VII, and thus

the forty years' schism was commenced. Germany, England, Poland, Prussia, Sweden and Denmark remained loyal to Urban, while France, Spain, Scotland and Lorraine submitted to Clement. The "one Church" of Boniface was rent and his monster of two heads for one body was realized. It was the opportunity for the supremacy of episcopacy which quickly asserted itself. The doctrine of the absolutism of the Pope was in abeyance. He whom the Isidorean Decretals, Gregory VII, and Boniface VIII had declared to be above all human tribunals—a doctrine accepted by Alcuin and a great many others—found himself arraigned in the general Councils before a court of bishops. At Constance these Popes, for now there were three, accepted the sentence of deposition, or resigned to avoid it, and retired. The French, who from the time of Hinckman at least had been reserved in their obedience, never surrendered until the Vatican Council decreed against their doctrine of the supremacy and infallibility of the Episcopate. This doctrine was nicknamed Gallicanism by the Ultramontanes. It was for many years the doctrine of the Roman Catholics in England. Outside of Italy and the Jesuits it was the prevailing doctrine everywhere during the first quarter of the Nineteenth Century. The Vatican Council showed that of the seven hundred prelates assembled in it the minority opposed to absolutism was so large that the fate of the infallible decree was for some time uncertain. This historical review will help us to detect better the dangers that lurk in that decree.

The great reformatory councils, Pisa, Constance, Basle, and Florence, had not removed entirely the papal scandal for they had ended, where they began, with two Popes, yet they had inaugurated a somewhat better state of things. It was not long until one Pope was settled in Rome. Pisa and Constance have not unquestioned recognition by the Pope as oecumenical councils, and because of the supremacy of the Episcopate perhaps they never will. The reformatory work was not thorough and the way was left open for another Council. Luther's



appeal, from which he afterwards receded, raised the cry for it. The Popes, jealous of the Episcopacy, were afraid of it, but could not arrest it, and at length Paulus III summoned it in 1545. This new Council, held at Trent, had one mark of universality that Pisa and Constance lacked—it was convoked by the Pope. It closed in 1563. During its session three Popes had been on the throne. It was never large, never equaling the first council of Nice. Its decrees at its adjournment were published by the authority of Pius IV and thus received papal endorsement. Two hundred years later it was still further endorsed by the Vatican Council. Trent was Rome's answer to Augsburg. It was a protest against Protestantism. It deals almost exclusively with the issues between Roman Catholics and Protestants. It was the fullest statement and definition of Roman Catholic doctrine that had up to that time been made, but it was not a complete Roman creed. There was no definition of the Church nor of the rights and powers of the Episcopacy. There is no mention of the Pope except at the very end it is said in regard to abuses of indulgences "that after the opinions of the other bishops they may be referred to the Sovereign Pontiff by whose authority and prudence that which may be expedient for the universal Church may be ordained." That is a long way off from the absolutism that had been so often claimed, yet that absolutism was not denied. A great many things were left open and some of the questions were pressing. Pius IV made the attempt at a practical supply by his *Professio Fidei Tridentinae*. It was a confession of faith confirmed by an oath which every bishop and every officer of the Church was required to take. It was a summary of the distinctive doctrines of the Roman faith. There was appended this oath of obedience: "I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Church for the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter, Prince of Apostles and vicar of Jesus Christ." The Vatican

Council was needed to define the place of the Pope in the Roman system.

During the three hundred years between these two Councils the greatest question was in regard to the seat of ultimate authority. They were all agreed that the source of final authority was the Holy Scriptures and unwritten traditions. That was the norm of faith and morals. The Scriptures included the Apochrypha. The books which were not admitted to the Old Testament canon were arbitrarily pronounced inspired. If there were authentic sayings of our Lord and his inspired Apostles transmitted orally, they would be of equal authority with those in the New Testament, but there are no such traditions. The challenge to produce them has never been met. But this is of vital importance to Rome for the whole doctrine of the Papacy rests on it. There is no positive proof that Peter was in Rome, much less that he was Pope there for twenty-five years. It can be proved only by tradition. That fictitious treasury of oral traditions is very convenient for an infallible Pope to draw upon as he needs it. The secondary, or derived authority, is in the Church. Here was the point of controversy between Jesuit and Jansen, the Ultramontane and Gallican. The Church is the sole and the infallible interpreter of the Scriptures and traditions. But in whom was that power of interpretation lodged? There was pretty general agreement that the Church spoke in part by the unanimous consent of the Fathers. But that was limited by its extent. It did not cover the whole field of truth. As a matter of fact no such consent existed beyond a few of the most fundamental doctrines. Abelard in his *Sic et Non* had demonstrated it. Fathers of equal standing could be quoted on opposite sides of any subject. Even on the famous text on which the doctrine of the Papacy rests there were five different interpretations. But the Papacy picked out that one, though supported by a much smaller number, that favored its claim and ignoring the others said this is the unanimous faith of the Church from the beginning. The testimony of the Fathers in



most other things is used in the same way. By that method an infallible Pope can prove anything he wants. The question of authority was about that of the Pope and of the Episcopate and of the consent of the whole Church. Some said it was with the Pope without limitation, others that he was infallible when he addressed the whole Church, and still others when the Episcopate approved and the entire Church assented. But the Gallicans said, that the infallible authority rested with the infallible Episcopacy. This was the doctrine, that was generally prevalent in the northern part of Europe and America. There was an oath taken by Roman Catholics in England and Ireland, from 1791 to at least 1825, that said, "It is not an article of faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess, that the Pope is infallible." It was upon this proof of the fact, supported as it was by oath, that Roman Catholics are not bound to obey the Pope in civil matters, that the Emancipation Act was finally passed by Parliament. And the Pope knew of all these transactions but never indicated his disapproval. That infallible and irreversible decree of 1870 declared that the infallible power of deciding all matters of faith and morals is not in the Church as an approving body, not in the Episcopate, nor in General Councils but in the Pope alone when he speaks *ex cathedra*. The bishops are only his agents in transmitting and enforcing his decrees. This decree is so momentous and far-reaching in its scope that it demands our careful study of its real intent.

The Papal infallibility seems to be in one sense limited by the "*ex cathedra*." It is not said that he is infallible in his personal beliefs. Innocent III, Innocent IV, Hadrian VI, Pius IV, and other Popes have admitted that there have been or may be heretical Popes. It is of little force against the infallibility to cite these admissions and to point to Zosinus, Liberius, Vigilius and even Honorius, for it will be replied that their opinions and heresies were personal, not official. If a Pope should contradict some other Pope it can always be said, unless both are expressly said to be *ex cathedra*, that the one was only the

Pope's private opinion. Nor is it said that the Pope is infallible in his private life. The scandalous lives of Benedict IX and Alexander VI and John XXIII and a host of others do not count against this decree because they were only personal and private, though we may ask how can infallibility in regard to faith and morals find an agent in such disreputable characters. We may ask, too, with Dr. Schaff, how is it that if an infallible Church demands an infallible head, a Holy Church does not demand a holy Pope. Nor does this infallibility require infallibility of judgment in regard to questions of facts, except where these facts are directly related to matters of faith and morals. The Pope who endorsed the Council that condemned Honorius may have made a mistake as to the fact that Honorius approved the Eutychean heresy, and therefore the condemnation is null and void. This distinction between a matter of faith and a matter of fact may afford a gate of escape from many a difficulty. Allocutions, letters and decrees may not be necessarily *ex cathedra*. The faithful may often be puzzled to decide whether a document is infallible or not. That *ex cathedra* gives a great deal of elasticity to the decree.

The Vatican Decrees, which the infallible Pope published as his own, give us some definitions of the range of his powers. Archbishop Manning, one of the most ardent infallibilists, says the Pope is independent of the *Ecclesia docens* and of the *Ecclesia discens*, and that he is absolute because he is not answerable to any human or ecclesiastical law, but he is limited by the office of guarding, expounding and defending the deposit of revelation. The Decrees say that "the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that they might make known new doctrine, but by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles." The Pope's rulings in faith and morals must not contradict or transcend the Holy Scriptures as found in the standard text of the Vulgate, unwritten traditions, the decrees of the Oecumenical Councils and the unanimous consent of the Fath-



ers. But this limitation seems to be at once removed by the article which declares that the Holy Mother Church, of which the Pope is head, "has the sole right to judge the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures." Therefore it is not permitted to any one "to interpret the Sacred Scriptures contrary to this sense." If this infallible, independent Pope, who is not answerable to any court human or ecclesiastical, should find some new doctrine in the Bible or in the unanimous consent of the Fathers, as new and groundless as that of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Papacy, what can the faithful do about it except bow in most humble submission, as Kenrick, Hefele, Strossmayer, Kettler and others did to the decree of infallibility. If he should declare himself *ex cathedra* inspired, as he will one day do, the faithful must believe it. That wall that Manning and the Vatican Decrees throw around the Pope to limit him turns out to be only of exceedingly thin paper. Here is absolutism in the sphere of faith.

But this absolute Pope, Pius IX, set some limits to the Papacy. He proclaimed *ex cathedra* the Immaculate Conception and fixed Mariolatry, that comes so dangerously near plain and simple idolatry, forever upon the Church. By this same decree in which he proclaimed his own infallibility he gave unqualified endorsement to the Tridentine decrees, and made the doctrine of the canon, and of the standard text, which rules out textual criticism, and of original sin, and of justification and of the seven sacraments—including auricular confession, baptismal regeneration, transubstantiation, and communion under one species—and of indulgences, and of purgatory, and all the other distinctive doctrines as defined at Trent forever irreversible. If ever there is an organic union with Rome, Protestant and Greek must deny every distinctive doctrine of their own Church and swallow Trent, Vatican, Pope and all. The talk we sometimes hear of the organic union of all Christendom seems like simpering nonsense.

The Vatican decrees indicate something of the func-

tions of this infallible, absolute Pope. He is called the Supreme Judge. "Since by the divine right of Apostolic primacy the Roman Pontiff is placed over the universal Church, we further teach and declare that he is the Supreme Judge of the faithful and that in all cases, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may reopen the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgments." This primacy of jurisdiction extends not only over the Church but over the whole world. "We renew the definition of the oecumenical Council of Florence in virtue of which all the faithful must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses primacy over the whole world." That word "world" can only be interpreted by Papal claims and assertions to mean the ecclesiastical and secular world. This primacy is "not simply of honor but also of true and proper jurisdiction." This jurisdiction is carefully defined as immediate and direct. "The Roman Pontiff has the right of free communication with the pastors of the whole Church and their flocks." Again a little more fully: "This power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate, to which all of whatsoever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both collectively and individually, are bound by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world." This absolute, infallible Pope keeps the reins not only upon bishops and pastors but also upon every individual. "This is the teaching of the Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation." To question the absolutism of the Pope is to be forever lost. This is the statement clear and express of the irreversible decrees.

That clause about "morals," and "discipline and government of the Church" is not very definite and may be made to cover a great many things that did not at first



occur to us. The terms are indefinite. Who has the right to fix the limits of the power of the Pope over them? We may be certain that Archbishop Manning's answer will be endorsed by Rome. He says "That the necessity of the Unity and of the Sovereignty both temporal and spiritual of the Holy See" is a doctrine of revelation. He puts the defining power of the limits of Church and State solely in the hands of the Church: "The spiritual knows with divine certainty the limits of its own jurisdiction, and it knows, therefore, the limits and competence of the civil power. It is thereby in matters of religion and conscience supreme. Any power which is independent and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions is ipso facto supreme." In morals and in matters in any way related to the discipline and government of the Church the State has only such powers as the Pope may graciously concede to it.

The Pope has an unlimited authority over morals. Morals run through our entire voluntary life. The moral includes not only our conduct but our thoughts, and relations, civil, domestic and personal. He is the supreme ruler of one's whole life and has the right to lay down a schedule for every deed, word and feeling to which we must conform under the penalty of the loss of eternal life. The claims of the Pope wherever applied must come into conflict with what the civil authorities have always claimed to be their rights, a claim which our Lord seemed to recognize when he said "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." The civil laws are based on moral principles. If the Pope alone can define morals he has the power of annulling any law he may choose. Gladstone mentions some of the points where the two authorities come into contact: "marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, poor relief, incorporations, mortmain, religion, endowments, celibacy, and obedience." We can easily add a great many more. The Pope may try to regulate the rate of interest, for he has done it. He may try to prevent the freedom of the press, for he has done it in recent times.



He may forbid free discussion of any subject upon which he proposes to legislate. He may dictate to the State about establishing a religion. He may interdict the trial of any priest by any other than an ecclesiastical court, no matter what the crime. He may enthrone or depose rulers. He may make any other than Roman marriages illegal. He may legislate about what we shall eat not only on fast days but any other day. He has precedents for all these things and the right to act without any precedent. The Papacy has always been opposed to any form of democracy and favored absolute monarchy. If the absolutism of the Vatican Council could be carried out it would be the extinction of religious, political, civil, and personal liberty. We are sure that this decree of universal control will never be realized but we are equally sure that it will be put into effect just as far as conditions will allow. Popes have always been politic and shrewd in availing themselves of opportunities. Here in America we seem to be perfectly secure. Ten millions in one hundred millions are an insignificant minority. Ordinarily it is. But the Romanists were a small minority in England in the time of Elizabeth and James I. Still the peace and safety of the government required that they be disfranchised. They were only a small minority in 1825 but they were required to state on oath that in case of conflict between the Pope and the King in any civil matter they would obey the King, before Parliament dared to enfranchise them. Papal influence must have been meddling with the civil affairs of Germany when the Jesuits were expelled from Prussia and Bismack said, "I will not go to Canossa." The balance of power is sometimes to be feared. We find its influence in the very dawn of the historic period. It was one of the means of transference from the ethnic to the demotic government. Strangers who located in a city as soon as they had a sufficient number offered themselves to the leaders of one of the parties with the pledge of perpetual support if they were enfranchised and they were always promoted to citizenship. The Mormons are a very small minority in the United



States but they have the balance of power in some of the Northwestern States and they are felt in our national politics. Radicals exaggerate what they call the Romish peril, but some danger exists. By the balance of power Roman Catholic influence is effective in many municipalities in securing benefits that no other Church can get. Possibly it is keenly felt today in Washington. Authors say that a book dealing with any phase of the Roman Catholic question can not find a publisher until it has been censored by Roman Catholic authorities. A distinguished Lutheran who was a candidate for the United States Senate says he was defeated by the Roman Catholic vote. There is some reason for fearing that our civil liberties may be disturbed more than we like.

The Syllabus of Pius IX is an important document. It is the key to the Vatican decrees. It was an authorized summary of the what seem to be *ex cathedra* statements. The Roman Catholic writers are not agreed whether the Syllabus is *ex cathedra* or not, but if not "official" it is just as binding upon all Romanists until it is recalled. It was sent to all bishops as a rule in exercising Church discipline and government. Everybody must believe it or be lost. It is very significant of the purposes and methods of the Papacy in the future. If we ask what we may expect of the absolute infallible Pope, here is our answer.

This document is called *Syllabus Errorum*. It condemns errors but of course maintains the opposite. It will be clearer if we give the positive rather than the negative side. The Position of the Papacy on

1. The Relation of Church and State. The declarations are in sections five and six. It is affirmed that the Church should not be separated from the State nor the State from the Church, (55). It is denied that the State has any independent sphere, that there are civil rights over which the Pope as head of the Church has not direct jurisdiction, and that all laws passed by legislatures are not subject to his authority. He can veto any law or set aside the decision of any court. So it is expressly said that kings and princes and all civil rulers are sub-



ject to the jurisdiction of the Church (54). The Roman Church is the only one that can be an established Church for it is denied that national churches can be established by countries that have been withdrawn from the authority of the Roman Pontiff (37). The Pope has the sole right of deciding in cases of conflict of jurisdiction what is civil and what is ecclesiastical, and it is denied that the State has any power to define the rights and limits within which the Church may exercise its authority (42, 19). Any law of marriage, jurisdiction over criminal priests, contracts, oaths, taxes, the right of holding property, that conflicts with any law of the Church is void. No bequest to the Church can be taxed by any government without the consent of the Pope. "The Church is a true, and perfect and entirely free society and enjoys peculiar and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her divine Founder." She alone has the power of defining her rights and limits, and this power is vested in an infallible pope. The civil authorities are but instruments of the Church, a mode of administration in its jurisdiction in temporal things.

2. The Deposing Power. This is not expressly stated in the Syllabus but very clearly implied. It affirms that the Roman Pontiff and oecumenical Councils have never exceeded the limits of their powers nor usurped the rights of princes (23). We remember the meddling of the Bishops of Rome with the throne of Constantinople, and Chilpevic deposed by Zacharias and Lothaire threatened with deposition by Nicholas I, and Henry IV deposed so far as the Pope could do it by Gregory VII, and Raymond of Toulouse by Innocent III because Raymond was not sufficiently active against the Albigenses, and Henry VIII by Paul III in a Bull beginning with the words "The condemnation and excommunication of Henry VIII King of England," and Elizabeth whose deposition was attempted by Pius V. These cases were too prominent to be overlooked even by a Pope who was not well versed in history, and when he says that the Roman Pontiffs have never usurped the rights of princes he affirms the abiding right of the Pope to dethrone upon his own motion the



ruler of any country. Pius IX repeats what other Popes had said, that this right is inherent in the office of Supreme Judge.

3. Ecclesiastical Courts. Ecclesiastical courts for temporal causes of the clergy, whether civil or criminal, ought not to be abolished (31). Ecclesiastical courts are constituted solely of ecclesiastical officials. As in court-martials the court is composed of military officers, so an ecclesiastical court is composed of clergymen. We had believed that here was one question that was forever settled, but it has been reopened and affirmed. Matters of contract in litigation between a clergyman and layman, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, are to be tried in a court of clergymen. A priest accused of a foul crime like seduction or murder cannot be tried in the civil courts, but must be tried by clergymen. Here is a body of people living among us, enjoying the rights and privileges of citizens and protected by the laws, but which is to be wholly exempt from civil jurisdiction. And this immunity of ecclesiastical persons is not derived from civil but from divine law (30). No self-respecting government can for one moment admit such a claim. We may persuade ourselves that the Pope will never undertake to enforce it in a Protestant country but the claim is made by an infallible Pope and every Catholic must admit it. An attempt at partial enforcement is not impossible nor improbable. The Pope may put in any country every informant, every officer who arrests, every witness who testifies against, every juryman who votes affirmatively, and every judge who passes sentence upon a priest, under excommunication. If it should be done justice would be hampered even in England and the United States of America.

4. Force. This was another claim we had thought forever dead but it is openly and boldly asserted in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century. The Church has the power of availing herself of force or of any direct or indirect temporal power (24). The Pope may release any subjects from any oath of allegiance, put a country under interdict and suspend all religious services so that

no sacrament is administered, no one can be married, no one properly buried, no church opened and the faithful brought to spiritual desolation. The horrors of the Inquisition may be revived. Faithful and obedient sovereigns may be commissioned to make war upon a refractory country, as Philip II of France was enjoined to seize England, and Philip II of Spain to send the Invincible Armada to take possession of the kingdom of the heretical Elizabeth. There may be any kind of force, direct or indirect, ecclesiastical or physical, any and every means available to subdue a rebellious ruler or people. We seem to be reading a decree of the darkest period of the Middle Ages.

5. Education. The Church of Rome has a right to interfere in the discipline of the public schools, in the arrangement of studies, in the conferring of degrees, and in the selection of teachers (45, 47). The system of instructing the youth which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church cannot be approved by Catholics (48). A system of absolutism would not be complete without beginning with the schools, and here the right of the Pope to prescribe the curriculum, to select the teachers and even regulate the conferring of degrees is explicitly and repeatedly stated. Let Romanists control the education of the country and it will take only one generation to make it wholly Roman Catholic. If our government has erred in excluding all religion from the public schools in the protection of the rights of conscience, it has erred on the safer side. The Pope would limit the investigations of science to his own definitions of doctrines and reinstate the methods and principles of the old scholastic doctors (13). Thomas Aquinas would become again the great model of all teachers. Intellectual as well as civil and religious liberty would be forever dead.

6. Marriage. This absolutism would invade the sanctity of the family. The Pope is very much in earnest about it. He devotes a whole chapter to it. There is no proper marriage except by a Roman Catholic priest.



The Church has the sole power of declaring the impediments to marriage. Matrimonial causes and espousals, by their nature, do not belong to civil jurisdiction (65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 75). Marriages in England, and perhaps in America, by a mere technicality are barely tolerated. In the eyes of Rome our marriages are only contracts under intermeddling civil laws and we are not really married at all. If the Pope could he would set them all aside, declare our children illegitimate and allow us to marry whom we pleased. It has been done. Gladstone gives a case with which he was personally acquainted and which was well known in England. An English gentleman married an English lady in some foreign country. They were married by the English chaplain in the presence of the British Minister. They lived together for a quarter of a century and had grown children. The man fell in love with another woman. He joined the Church of Rome. He was married in a Roman chapel by a Roman priest. The matter was carried to the Pope who pronounced the first marriage null and the second valid. Under the British law the man was guilty of bigamy. We are not told that he was prosecuted, but in most of our States he would have been sent to the penitentiary. Gladstone mentions, without giving the reference, the case of a man who was permitted by Gregory II to quit his wife because she was sick, and marry another. It may be that Nicholas I espoused the cause of Theutberg, not so much because of her injured innocence, as because of her royal brothers whose support he needed.

Modern Vaticanism so far as it prevails is an obstacle to all progress. It is the enemy of free thought and free speech. It is an enemy of the freedom of the press. In 1841 the Pope condemned the Austrian law which established freedom of the press, of science, of education, of opinion and of conscience. He said that by that law all liberty of opinion and literary arts, all liberty of faith, of conscience and of teaching was established. That is the reason he condemned it. His friends say that it was in accord with a concordat with Austria, but that does not change the fact that he is opposed to all liberty of thought

and discussion. If not, what fault could he find with the law? A fundamental law in sociology is that all advancement is conditioned upon freedom of thought, and that freedom of discussion is the essential condition of progress. It is a law of nature. Unless somebody is allowed to think out new things and the people to discuss them how can society get away from old customs. If an infallible Pope has been commissioned to be our teacher in faith and morals and also in things temporal, to set limits to all our investigations and even decide facts of history for us, and we are bound to accept without question everything he says where is there any room for intellectual and moral development? Gladstone did not put it too strong when he said that no man can become a convert to this modern Vaticanism without renouncing his moral and mental freedom. He forgets his manhood and becomes a puppet. Such a convert encounters an insoluble problem on the threshold. He finds an infallible Council at Constance, and an infallible Pope endorsing it, declaring that Popes were not infallible, but at Rome an infallible Council and an infallible Pope denying just what Constance asserted. If he accepts Martin V as Pope he must accept the Council which elected him, and if he accepts that he can not accept the Vatican and its doctrine of infallibility. That is only the beginning of the absurdities he must swallow. "Feed my sheep," says nothing about infallibility, but we must believe that it means all that Rome has read into it, or forfeit our salvation. Where is the end?

We make no attack upon Roman Catholic people. Many of them are just as good and loyal citizens as any Protestant. If the time comes that they must either obey the Pope or our government in its legitimate sphere we are confident that they will not hesitate to take the side of their country. We are only stating facts that may hurt some persons, but facts that have a right to be known by both Roman Catholics and Protestants. Truth and frank honest discussion should be welcomed by all parties. Supreme interests are involved.

*Roanoke College, Salem, Va.*



## ARTICLE II.

## THE PROBLEM OF WAR.

BY PROFESSOR W. H. WYNN, PH.D., D.D.

## ROUND TABLE SOLUTION.

Tennyson, in his "Idyls of the King," makes the legend of King Arthur and his Round Table symbolize the "war of sense with soul," or, otherwise, the struggle that all men must have in getting the lower nature in due subjection to the higher nature, the order in which all true manhood must evermore unfold.

King Arthur represents the higher nature; the heathen hordes that are harrying his dominions and the infirm temper and unsteady purpose of his wayward knighthood, the lower nature; and the twelve great battles, the varying successes and reverses which the contest involves. As a spiritual allegory our English literature has nowhere its equal, and we very much doubt whether, as a masterpiece in this line, there is anything to compare with it in the whole realm of letters in ancient and modern times. For one thing, the poet's skill in all that goes to make up the subtle magic of his technique, is phenominally artistic and original, and, as we should say, inimitable, to such an extent as to entitle him to be called "the master of all the masters of song."

But to our mind, the chief distinction of the "Idyls of the King" is the moral they convey. In spite of the critics, we put this down at the head of our list—he has embodied in his allegory the highest privileges and prerogatives of the poetic mind. We are told that to propose a moral to a mood of frenzy, which is confessedly the poet's high moment of inspiration for his task, would be to cool down and extinguish the ardor of that moment, and turn the rapt singer into a sayer of saws.

But counsel like this, literally construed, would mean

that all genuine poetry must be in the nature of rhapsody—rhapsody, in the sense of inspired raving, if such a thing is conceivable—spontaneous, incoherent, orphic utterance, after the manner of the priestess of Apollo in her mantic spell. No critic would stand for a judgment of that kind, even in the extreme of his anxiety to fortify the spontaneity of the poet's inspiration against the intrusion of a moral idea that would draw down his afflatus to the level of prose. Rather he would warn the poet against dressing up his moral in an analytic garb—against trying to make the syllogism vibrant on the strings of his lyre. We know,, absolutely, that there is no trace of this in Tennyson's "Idyls of the King"—the allegory in no sense embarrasses the magic of his verse.

But not to delay longer on this point, we may go on to say that the allegory in this great masterpiece of Tennyson has a message of momentous import to the times in which we live. Historically the Arthurian wars were wars of self-defense—a Christian people in the island of Britain repelling the heathen tribes that had invaded their country with the view of killing off the inhabitants and taking the land to themselves. To resist these marauders, and save his country, the brave Arthur organized his Round Table, a company of 150 brave knights, with the Holy Grail in their lead. Tennyson addressed himself to the high venture of discovering the moral meaning of so singular and romantic a crisis, in the early history of what came afterward to be the leading civilization of our western world.

It is not too much to say that, in discharging this task, he has wrestled philosophically with the stubborn problem of war, and with such inner illumination toward its solution as we do not find elsewhere.

#### "WAR OF SENSE WITH SOUL."

"War is hell,"—war as initiative, is always and only the apocalyptic madness let loose from the pit. Equipped with the fierce explosives and deadly mechanical devices of our modern military art, it becomes a system of organized cruelty so horrible and revolting, that the whole



civilized world has, at last, become aroused to the feasibility of one great united effort in putting it down. But it persists. Against all opposition it presents a defiant front. Just when we thought that the great powers of the world were pledged for its overthrow, it breaks out with unprecedented fury all round the horizon, and sets at naught the peace-craving impulses of thousands of well-meaning but disconcerted men. As if to say: "Your plans are eminently humane; they represent the highest in you; they are magnanimous; they are divine; but I am here to stay, and I will never take down my bloody banner so long as human nature remains as it is."

Now, it is in the very phrasing of this challenge that the poet plants his allegory, which was to be a generous solution of the problem of war. The Round Table shall tell the tale. War, as it is enacted out yonder in the battlefields of the world—the carnival of carnage that has marked the course of our human history from its earliest dawns down even to the present day—what is it but the reflection of the war that goes on in the experience of the individual man, between his higher and lower nature, and is destined to continue so long as the lower nature refuses to be subdued?

Here was a band of men, brave knights, whose oath bound them to fealty to "their conscience and their king"—to their conscience, by all means, as giving them the victory, primarily, over themselves, and then, assuredly, over the savage invaders that were devastating their land. Alas! Alas!—aside from Arthur, and one or two other exemplary knights, the "war of sense with soul" was a failing enterprise, with men who were unquestionably great in physical power, but fatally infirm in the sinew of their moral resolve—Lancelot, for example, and Modred, and Garvain, and Tristram, and, indeed, all the rest of them, as their declining prestige is depicted in the "Holy Grail."

The Round Table went down under the evil supremacy of the animal man. After the great "Battle of the West," against the traitor, Modred, there was but one knight

left to minister to the wounded Arthur, and the glory of the ancient order faded away with the disappearance of the king's barge over the sease. The Round Table was gone, and Arthur's court at Camelot ceased to be.

But the lesson was worth the forfeit. War will be with us so long as the passions and appetites of the animal man hold the reins, and dictate the policy, and determine the spirit of the influences that are, at any time, dominant in the mind of an age. The love of money, and the lust of rule, with the baser demons that keep company with these, are the familiar furies that laid waste the antique splendor of Arthur's dominions, and are to-day lighting the fires of international race hatred and political mania, in the whole wide compass of the European States.

Somewhere among the ruling spirits of the warring nationalists, there is a Lancelot or a Modred, upon whom the concentrated curse of offended humanity will rest, for having rushed, with inconsiderate haste, into the unimaginable horrors of an unprecedented war. And that, too, when the Hague was the seat of Arthur's court, to which these same ambitious leaders had but recently gone up in quest of the Grail, and from which they had returned with the banner of the Prince of Peace ostensibly waving over them—but really, it would seem, a decoy to the god of war.

#### WAR AND THE EVANGEL.

We recall how the great Christian preachers of this country have denounced war, William Ellery Channing, for example, Theodore Parker, Mr. Beecher, Dr. Schmucker, Mr. Talmage, Philips Brooks, Prof. Swing—the list is a long one of the nation-wide representatives of pulpit renown, who have no soft words for the evils of war, and who did not scruple, on occasion, to call it the arch-enemy of God and man.

One time, while listening with rapt attention to one of these orators, whose theme was far enough off from battle-stained banners and garments rolled in blood, we



were nudged by a neighbor at our side, with the whispered admonition that we must look for an anti-bellum demonstration in the preacher's peroration, for he was never known to wind up a sermon, no matter on what topic, without a scathing denunciation of the evils of war. Sure enough the denunciation came, but it was so inwoven with the gospel theme he had in hand, and so powerful and pleading in its appeal for peace, that we joined with the audience in spontaneous applause.

And why not? His gospel was an evangel of peace, view it on any side you will. It came out of the sky, touched into music by the song of choiring angels, with peace for its diapason, "peace on earth to men of good will"—that is, to men who would enthrone it over their wills, and make it their guiding star in the relations of life. It was no exaggeration to hold and to preach, that the comprehensive burden of the new religion, at that time coming into the world, was expressed in that one word, "peace," and that He that brought it, should be clothed with the summary title of the "Prince of Peace."

Peace! Peace!—a moment's thought will make it plain that it is a state of mind that directly antagonizes war; that it abhors war; that it redeems from war; that where it really is, war cannot be. But it is strange that the conditioning clause in this peace proclamation should have been so long overlooked—misrendered, indeed, so as to make the reign of peace in the world a consummated fact, rather than the long historical process, by which men would adjust themselves freely to the benignity of its sway. Looking at the Judean Babe, and hearing the coronation song, we are likely to say: "Why, there it was; at that very date, and underneath that very sky, the kingdom of peace was set up, and if it has been slow in its conquests—oh, discouragingly slow—it was because, with its divine Founder, a thousand years is as one day, and one day as a thousand years."

As we understand it, the song did not run that way. Peace was come to earth in that Prince of Peace, to those who would have a good will toward Him, as He would

have an abounding good will toward them. It was to be a kingdom of good will in the hearts of all those who would have a good will toward it—otherwise if a kingdom at all, it must be a kingdom of force. O, when shall we learn, that nothing divine ever enters the currents of our human history, except on the condition of its free appropriation on the part of those who can understand what it is, and who are resolved to take up their burden of responsibility, and push it forward with a will!

We are living in a moral world, are we not? And that means, that the chief thing in history, the thing to which all other agencies and influences invariably point, is the responsibility of the individual man. The universe, so far as our corner of it can tell the tale, is an arena for the trainer and the trained, else it is a blind rush of cosmical forces that build up and pull down, with only a brute instinct to see things whirl around aimlessly, in a never-ending vortex of change. Evolution, so far as it concerns the history of humanity, as we find it here on earth, is distinctively a training of the will; and we must forever bear in mind, that such training cannot, in the nature of the case, resort to coercive measures in enforcing its rule.

Why did not this kingdom of peace, being a divine kingdom, as we say, and coming with such a cry of triumph out of the Judean sky, make an end to war, from that time forth, even as its way was prepared by a universal armistice among the nations of the world? A fair question to be asked, but unhappily assuming that this kingdom of peace could somehow propagate itself by some sort of force. Plainly that would be war putting down war, always and necessarily a contradiction in terms. And yet we are apprized of the long-time, inveterate, infirmity of those who call themselves followers of the Nazarene—the disposition to fight their religion into supremacy, as the irate disciples of the Master, at one time, urged Him to avenge Himself on the inhospitable Samaritans, by calling down the lightnings of heaven to set their wicked cities on fire.

What a blunder!—and yet that kind of crude disciple-



ship clings, with strange tenacity, to minds otherwise kindly disposed. One look of the Master!—that ought to be enough. He “came not to bring a sword but peace.” It is altogether probable that, if He had seen proper, He might have stood upon the border of the little country in which He was born, and, by the simple waving of His hand, dispersed the Roman fleets, and rolled back the Roman legions, and in this manner delivered His people from the yoke of Roman rule—probable, since He was a miraculous man. But His title as the Prince of Peace in that act would have been forfeited, and we should have known Him thereafter as a man of war.

As a matter of fact, we search in vain throughout all the doings and teachings of our divine Master, for anything that would consort at all with the spirit of war—it is all on the other side—all—all.

Nevertheless, we must not give place to the idea that, in the evolution of the kingdom of peace, it might not sometimes occur that it would be driven to a defensive war, when, for example, an armed force were moving on it, with the purpose prepense of wiping it out. Was not such a contingency recognized by the Master Himself when, about to encounter the perils of His last tragic hours, He counseled His little company to equip themselves, each one, with a sword; and, on being told, that there were but two among them all, said: “It is enough”? Yes, possibly, if you take, in this connection, His subsequent and emphatic disapproval of the manner in which one of those swords was used. It was in Peter’s hands, and he offended in making it the aggressor, ere yet a single sword had been drawn on the other side. As if He had said: “We must bear long, suffer long, endure long, and only in dire extremity let our hand be lifted in self-defense.”

Even so, it is a delicate piece of Christian casuistry to put on the witness stand. It is so easy to plead a defensive war, in cases where the blame must be distributed quite equally among the belligerents on both sides —both sides, therefore, appealing to Heaven for the justice of

their cause. But who cannot see that it were best, in that case, to settle their differences by any other method than the awful arbitrament of war?

And yet, and yet, we are absolutely sure that Christianity has never exalted cowardice to a virtue, and has never disparaged patriotism, because of the stern schooling it must now and then have on the tented field. "Who-soever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other, also"—yes, but it will be in time, then, as did the Master Himself, in a situation of that kind, to remind the offender, that there is One above, to whom vengeance belongs, and that in the final reckoning He will be repaid.

#### PAX MUNDI, PAX ANIMI.

War! War! We often find a world of suggestion in the words which the primitive man invents to get his ideas and expressions into articulate shape. War means "waste," has the term "worse" for its affiliated root. It involves the dissolution of all the hallowed relations of life; of home; of family; of the social order—the altar-fires die out; the prayers of men turn to curses on their lips. We seem to witness the overthrow of the good, and the bad hoisting in triumph its bloody flag.

And yet we feel that, somewhere, in this mood of brooding, there is an incentive to put it in check. It is a dark enough picture, indeed. A war of unprecedented magnitude and brutality, and destined, in the end, to tear out the vitals of the civilizations that have had centuries for their growth, has come upon us, and those who are responsible for it must bear the curse of it—deep and condign to the last degree—with not a syllable of extenuation to be uttered in their behalf. But, we insist, the case is not so hopeless as it seems. A moment's thought will drop a ray of comfort into our desponding hearts.

It cannot be that a system of things so elaborately built up, through long centuries of historic evolution and upward advance, should lose its moorings all at once, and be tossed a helpless derelict on bloody seas—a complete



wreck in any storm that the desperate war lords of Europe may see proper to stir up. It cannot be—the world is not going to come to an end. The law of cataclysm, or eruptive convulsion, does not apply to the social life of man. Pick up your book of history—empires are not born in a day, and do not fall with a crash; all great eras come on as the twilight of morning merges into day. The myth of Deucalion was but the tempestuous dream of a poet, sung over the ravages of some devastating flood.

Europe, enlightened Europe, Christian Europe, is just now tossing in the tumult of military frenzy, that threatens to engulf her civilizations in a deluge of blood. And there can be no doubt about it, the ruin will be great. A war on that scale must work changes in the social life of the nations, more profoundly revolutionary than the wisest and wildest among them was able to foresee. But so long as our American civilization is immune against the contagion, and retains the “moral temper” that gives stability to our institutions, and keeps our ship of state true to its pole, it will be impossible for the current of history to turn backward in its course.

By “moral temper” we mean the spirit of peace. The individual citizen must make war impossible by cultivating the spirit of peace, in his own way of living and moving among his fellowmen—in other words the *pax animi* must be the fountain out of which the *pax mundi* will take its rise. “I am resolved henceforth to devote my best energies to the cultivation of the spirit of peace,” said our neighbor, after bewailing the unimaginable horrors of the European war. It was spontaneous, no doubt, this saying of his, an unconscious witness, so to speak, to the universal brotherhood of man. This state of war, covering a continent, and involving what seems to us the organic life of the leading civilizations of the globe, grew out of a general condition of moral delinquency, more or less prevalent all over the world. Our neighbor felt it, and instinctively interpreted his feeling, as meaning more than a temperamental revulsion at the unspeakable hor-

rors of a war on so large a scale—he had a quick sense of being somehow implicated in the issues of that war.

He had not cultivated the spirit of peace; he had talked about it; he had glorified it; he had festooned its altars with a profusion of rhetorical bouquets. He was the unit of society, and was doing what everybody else was doing, in pledging fealty to the kingdom of peace, as a mere matter of formal assent. Peace by compact!—how hollow this was, we all were made to see, when the Peace Congress sought to impale the subtle evangel on the point of a pen. While the great ones were formulating peace, and hemming in its conditions behind paper fortifications, the furnaces of international race hatred and diplomatic spleen, were being fired up to seven times hotter than hot, until our moral heavens to-day are mantled in the gloom of a war cloud, denser than has ever been witnessed in the annals of man.

If we are looking seriously for the secret of all this, we shall find it, without doubt, in the habitual dereliction of the individual man. Some degree of responsibility lies at our own doors. We must cultivate the spirit of peace in the little narrow social circles, in which we respectively move—cultivate it—you and I, busying ourselves in the detail of our ordinary routine. For, however limited our sphere of activity may be, if it is dominated by the cravings of appetite, or the desire to be uppermost at whatever cost, it easily becomes the spawning pool for the larvae of war. And this suggests a phase of our subject which we cannot overlook.

#### THE LARVAE OF WAR.

We recall the maxim: “If you would eradicate an evil you must dig it up by the roots.” In applying this principle to war, we are brought up abruptly against the sentiment, in certain quarters seriously entertained, that war is not an evil, or that it is a necessary evil, with which our human responsibility has nothing to do.

With reference to this, we have only to say, that we are



puzzled to know how any sane-minded man could ever entertain such an idea of war. To us the very term itself is an echo of the pit, or, otherwise, the intensified symbol of all forms of diabolism, actual or potential, in the experience of mankind. Not only an evil, but the breeding-pool of all evils, individual and social, with which humanity is cursed—this is war, and any other construction put upon it, must be reckoned down to the ravings of an unbalanced mind.

But, that a judgment so sweepingly denunciatory may not seem overwrought, consider, for a moment, the line of remark in which the apologists for war are wont to indulge. They appeal to science. In every domain of animated nature, they see antagonisms going on; conflicting tendencies lashing one another; the struggle for life and the survival of the fittest actually wrought out, in many cases, by the organized onset of the strong, and the extermination of the weak. In the ant-hill, yonder, a regular system of militarism is seen to prevail; so, also, in every hive of bees; so, also, among the great fish and the little fish that swarm in the seas. Everywhere there is war; the woods are full of it; the birds of the air and the beasts of the jungle have their campaigns of bloody onslaught; and, if progress is anywhere observable at all, it must have come about in exactly this way.

Going up into the realm of human history, they boldly challenge us to see the same order prevailing there; man emerging from the brute, and retaining the instincts of the brute, will turn his implements of industry into weapons of war. Tribe will war with tribe; nation with nation; and, out of it all, civilization will register its progress onward and upward through all the years.

Yes, but what is "civilization"?—a term absolutely without meaning, except among men, who by hypothesis are transcending the brute. The term "man," in its far-off etymological source means a being who can "measure," that is to say, estimate values according as they are high or low in an ascending scale. In other words, he distinguishes between the animal man and the human

man, if we may so speak, both being integral in his complex make-up, but the human man endowed to rule, and the animal man endowed to serve.

Now it is agreed on all hands, that the characteristic note of our human stage of evolution, is what we call "altruism," or the obligation resting upon every man to treat his fellowman as he would treat himself. At this point, all those passions that kindle war are under arrest; hate; revenge; the war lord's ambition; the money lust putting on armor to carry its point. All these have their roots in the usurpations of the animal man.

And yet there are those who will venture to justify war on this very ground—man is an animal—that and nothing more—and, as in all other departments of the animal world, his animal needs must at all hazards be supplied—must—must. They call our attention to the necessity of competition in the world of trade—going on to say, that competition, a law of trade, is nevertheless a species of blood-letting, and may be considered the larvae of war on a larger scale. And so we have war in miniature evermore with us, in the organized business interests of our everyday life—shall we object, if, at some time, it might find occasion to break out on a national scale?

But there is a fallacy here, mischievous and misleading in the extreme. Competition, the law of trade, is not necessarily blood-letting in its spirit and aim—that would make all business men criminals in the eyes of the law. It is inconceivable that trade and exchange should go on at all, without the rivalries that are inseparable from the successful prosecution of any line of activity in the economic realm. How absurd, therefore, the ideas that the status of all competition is, inherently and necessarily, a warlike status, and, on that score, seek to justify war on any scale, even that which is, at this moment, drenching the fair fields of Europe with rivers of human blood.

Go through your business streets—you will be convinced, not only that there may be such a thing as honest rivalry among the great business concerns that are, each one, soliciting your custom by all honorable means, but



that honesty is the rule, and fraud the exception, even where the competition is most intense. Competition in trade and exchange the larvae of war!—competition essential to the organic life of society, therefore war on any scale that it may be waged, is equally essential to the life of society!—verily here is a species of reasoning, that only an organization of assassins could consistently adopt.

It is a curious coincidence, that the same economic conception that is used in backing up war, is also used in tearing it down. We have a school of visionary reformers among us, who reason in this way: Society, as now organized, rests on the belligerent principle of business competition, which is war in embryo—always and only war, and still war—conflicting interests planning all the time to crush one another out. The thing to be done, is, to tear the existing order down, and re-organize in such a way as to make competition impossible, and the beneficent principle of co-operation put in its place. Then war will be no more, the brooding lair of the dragon having been swept away.

It is a beautiful dream, of course, and human withal, to have the old order give place to the new, with war eliminated—how our hearts should leap up to hail the day! But the major premise in this line of reasoning is absolutely false—competition is not an economic dagger hid under every business man's sleeve.

There is, indeed, what we call "cut-throat competition," but that is altogether a thing by itself. The adjective takes it clean outside the realm of economics, and reminds us that we are doing business in the moral world. A "cut-throat" anything is an act of war, and it may be a cut-throat religion, or a cut-throat civilization, such as is now embroiling all Europe in a scramble for blood. But no one would think for a moment of making religion, for example, responsible for the "cut-throat" atrocities which the war lords are just now committing in her name.

"Christ in armor?"—the very announcement sends a shiver of incongruity through our wounded sensibilities—

the sword He authorized was the "sword of His mouth," and the specific mission of that sword was, to cut out the heart of war. No, no, no—

"For never a carnal sword  
Shall be fleshed or flushed for Him,  
But only the beam of the brandished Word  
By flaming cherubim."

We may settle it once for all, that the larvae of war, are the unchastened impulses of the animal man; his cupidities; his ambitions; his lust of dominion; his money craze, the long and dark catalogue of crimes he will commit, in order that he may have the coveted chimera delivered at his door.

#### ABOLISHING WAR.

"No sensible man expects to abolish wars altogether"—a remark of President Lowell of Harvard University, in an able article of his in the *Atlantic Monthly* for September 1915. We must dissent—in the name of all that is dear and sweet in the religion we profess, we must dissent. There are men in our day, not lacking in sense, who verily believe the time will come, and is not far off, when war, in the common acceptation of that term, will be a thing of the past, and when the courts of all civilized nations will pronounce it a *malum in se*, nay, the crime of all crimes.

War is the marshalling of armies on the battlefield, for the purpose of settling international or domestic controversies by brute force—right accruing to the side which had the greater number of disciplined battalions at its command, and greater skill in the business of killing when the hour of conflict was on. You prove your cause by the number of the enemy's dead you may find on the battlefield, when what is left of the annihilated army has either surrendered or been put to flight. Looked at in this way, we can see no more reason in it, than in any



other survival of barbarism—the *ordeal*, for example, when a matter of personal guilt or innocence was sought to be divulged by a stretching on the rack.

As civilization advances barbarism is bound to recede. For long years the code of honor justified the practice of dueling, as between two persons, by way of avenging an insult, imaginary or real, dealt on the fair name of one or other of the parties concerned. Combat was to decide the issue—after so many paces traversed, back to back, wheeling at a given signal, face to face, the issue was to be decided by a random shot. When the atmosphere clears away you find yourself unscathed, and your defamer is reported dead. You have had your revenge, but in what way conceivable, will that fortunate accident operate to efface the cloud of aspersion left on your fair name?—you have but added stigma to stigma, in resorting to murder as a measure of imaginary self-defense.

Dueling was a relic of barbarism, and as such it has passed away. We risk nothing in saying, that the same fate awaits the business of war—for war is but dueling magnified to the scale of thousands and even millions who go in battle array to kill one another by way of settling a controversy that, after all, cannot be settled in that way. But does not that oblige us to say that no international controversy was ever settled by war? In one sense, yes—in another sense, no.

We must remember that there is a human side and a divine side to all historical events. War is a madness similar to the frenzy that took possession of the Jerusalem mob, that would not be satisfied until it had gibbeted the innocent Jesus on a Roman cross. That was the human part of it—the divine will came in to make that cross the pathetic symbol of the all-subduing pity of a merciful Heavenly Father, for the wayward children of His love. War, like all other evil, never realizes the precise object of its search, and, like all other evil, comes to be, in the end, the lash of retribution laid heavily over its own guilty limbs.

The confusion lies in crediting to war all the good

things which, under divine supervision, spring up and flourish in the wake of its devastating march—a new order of things superior to the old. War sets fire to great cities, and leaves in smoking ruins the long and labored accumulations of centuries of human enterprise and skill—if the heroic citizens will come right after, and put up splendid structures on the same site, would it be sensible to ascribe the improved order of things to the indemnifications of war? The discerning historian will never confound an occasion with a cause—will not credit the flood that swept away the dykes, with the mechanical skill and enterprise that built up stronger ramparts against the invading sea.

And, now, if our distinguished apologist for war has kept company with us thus far, we shall anticipate no difficulty in having him with us to the end.

We are living in a moral world. Our human history is at its best, when it shows a quickened sensitivity to the moral sense. We were barbarians once—that was ages and ages ago. Our civilization advances in proportion as we succeed in sloughing off the crudities and cruelties, the grossness, the inhumanities of that stage of barbarism, which was provisionally incident to the historical evolution of the race. No more certainly will the chrysalis burst its shell, than will our age of enlightenment throw off the institutions and customs of those earlier times, when the brute element in our human composition had a wider range. It must be so, or history is a farce.

Now, we do not err when we say, that the summary barbarism of the barbarous ages was war. Except when defined in terms of self-defense, it was the human brute, released from all moral restraint, and letting itself loose in the bloody ferocities of an inferno on earth. It was a process of killing or corrupting humanity by whatever means. It was under discipline always—rigid discipline—that was to keep the moral sensitivity of the human personality in temper as a machine, killing and being killed, and making no scruple as to the quality of the deed.



We have come upon a time when this outrage on the higher nature of man can no longer be condoned.

If we are puzzled to know why it has held on so long, dogging the footsteps of civilization with unabated fury for thousands of years of ineffectual struggle to throw it off—assuming, in our day, an aspect more monstrous and more formidable than ever before—why—our theory is, that these are the convulsive agonies of its day of doom.

Hitherto war has attached itself to one or another of the vital interests of the social life of man; his person; his property; his liberty; his country—making these the rallying cry of ambitious leaders, who, in this way, would win for themselves a warrior's renown. We must have noticed that the present war, on the part of those who have originated it has what they call 'kultur' for its watchword, by which term is meant the reorganization of society on a scientific basis, that is to say, on the theory of a "non moral state," and the system of a thoroughgoing militarism on which it is built. It is science under arms, and made to do duty at the feet of kings.

But what do we see?—when science goes into the business of war, its resources of destructive energy are so great, and its death-dealing automatism susceptible of such wide-spread distribution, that the war lords are made to discover, that they have harnessed to their chariots a kind of steed they cannot control. From all which we are driven to the conclusion, that we have come upon a stage in the history of our race, when war has become self-destructive by the inevitable rebound of the deadly machinery it has brought into play.

Hail to the issue—come, let us sing a paeon of peace.

*Tacoma, Wash.*

## ARTICLE III.

## A RECENT "HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS."

BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

Several times we had seen and heard recommendations of Dr. Frank Knight Sanders' "History of the Hebrews," and had come to the conclusion that it must be a good, useful and evangelical book, but had not found time to give it a personal examination. However, when we saw it meeting with the approval of the liberalistic writers (particularly of Bade in his "The Old Testament in the Light of Today," page x. of the preface), we decided that it would be well to examine the book for ourself. A good deal of suspicion was stirred in our mind on noting that Dr. Bade claimed Dr. Sanders as one of his "former teachers at Yale." If Dr. Sanders' teaching resulted in the production of such a book as Bade's, or did not prevent such a production, then Dr. Sanders' teaching, by that very token, could not have had very much evangelical virility and effectiveness; for we regard Bade's work as one of the most rationalistic and destructive works that has yet come from the American press. We may say here that, while Dr. Sanders' book is much better than Bade's, the latter is simply the legitimate fruit and logical outcome of the teaching of the former. Dr. Sanders accepts the premises, but declines to push on to the inevitable conclusion; while Dr. Bade has more courage and logic, and hence does not halt midway. However, this assertion awaits its proof at the proper place.

Dr. Sanders' book was published in 1914. At that time he was the president of Washburn College, Topeka, Kansas, which was founded by the Congregationalists, "but is non-sectarian in policy and government"; so says our encyclopedia. He is now Director of the Board of Missionary Preparation in New York City. The "Foreword" of Dr. Sanders' book would indicate that the volume is intended mainly for a college text-book (page vi).



This is also implied in his very gracious formula of dedication, which is as follows: "To the Students and Faculty of Washburn College, for whom and with whom we have spent five happy years." The title and sub-title of the book are as follows: "History of the Hebrews: Their Political, Social and Religious Development and Their Contribution to World Betterment."

To mention some of the commendable features of the book first, we are glad to say it is comparatively reverent in its attitude toward the Old Testament. In this respect it differs widely from the slashing treatment in Bade's book. Dr. Sanders does not directly criticise the ethics of the Old Testament, and never holds it up to ridicule and scorn, but usually gives it a mild kind of defense; that is, he explains the situations in such a way as to make a fair apologetic for some apparent ethical defects and discrepancies. Indeed, in some respects he offers quite a satisfactory defense of the Bible. The spirit and tone of the book are excellent. Much credit is given to the Old Testament for its pure religious teaching and powerful influence in the world. In many ways the book may seem to be an answer—without the least hint, however, that it is meant to be so—to the extreme positions of the radical critics. In this respect the book may be somewhat useful, serving as a kind of foil to the ultra radicals. Indeed, it is about the most successful attempt at maintaining the "mediating" position that we have yet seen among the smaller contributions to Biblical criticism. The temper of the book would certainly lead to the conclusion that its author is a man of a cordial and winsome disposition.

Having said so much in the book's favor, it is not pleasant to have to turn to finding flaws; but we must follow our conscience and reason. Such a book ought not to pass uncensored. The very fact that the writer exhibits so fine a spirit, and holds so many evangelical principles, makes his book all the more dangerous; all the better calculated to undermine the faith of young men and women in the Bible as an inspired and trustworthy revelation. The more truth a writer embodies in the

midst of fundamental error, the more insidious will be the peril; for in such a case many minds will not be able to separate the truth from the error. A man who approaches you with a concealed dirk is more dangerous than the man who comes flourishing his weapon in the open, announcing his intentions. So where Bade's open and frank assault will at once put the student on his guard, the suave, subtle, disguised method of the writer in question will be apt first to win the student's confidence, disarm his suspicion, and thus, ere he knows it, convert him to the rationalistic view. We have actually known young men who thought Dr. Sanders' book was really sound and evangelical, not being able to detect its subtle method of destroying the historical character of the Old Testament.

However, the foregoing assertions must now be made good. So let us look frankly at the book itself. We must be as brief as possible. We shall deal with the author's main positions, going into detail only in a few cases where necessity requires. First, here is a professed "History of the Hebrews," drawn mostly from the Old Testament itself, and yet it contains not a word about *divine inspiration*. The word "inspiration" does not occur in the index, and we cannot find it in the text. The word "inspirational" occurs (page 13), but has no reference to the doctrine of Biblical inspiration. It may be said that the author was not discussing the subject of inspiration, but writing a history of the Hebrew people; therefore such a discussion would have been irrelevant. But that is only an evasion, or at least a very lame apology. Where did Dr. Sanders get most of his material for his so-called "history"? From the Old Testament, which is an integral part of our Christian Bible. But Moses and the prophets all claimed to receive their messages directly from God—so the Bible declares again and again. Would that not connote just what we mean today by the doctrine of inspiration? Is it dealing adequately with the "history of the Hebrews" to ignore that claim, which lies at the very basis of their religion? Moreover, the New Testament, referring expressly to the Old Testament, as



is evident from the context, says (2 Tim. 3:16): "Every Scripture is inspired of God," etc. (We are convinced that this is the correct translation, though others may not agree.) Also 2 Pet. 1:20, 21: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation; for no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Now to write a professed history of the Hebrew people, and draw upon their sacred books as the main source material, and yet never even mention the claim of divine inspiration, is a manifest evasion of the most vital point in that history. No man would try to write a history of Mohammedanism without at least recognizing Mohammed's claim to a divine revelation, and endeavoring in some way to give an account of it. Read Irving's history, and see whether he side-steps this claim. Would an evangelical writer who truly believed in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures have written a history of the Hebrews without saying something about its claim to a divine origin? Remember, too, that the author in his sub-title announces that his book is to be a history of the "*religious* development" of the Hebrews. A part of that history, lying right there on the surface, is the claim of a direct divine revelation.

Next, we call attention to the critical authorities cited by our author (pages 337-353). He calls them "references for the teacher and student." He wants to encourage the habit of looking up these more extended works. He says: "Attention is called below to some of the best untechnical literature available today." Who are the writers cited? With all our searching we can find only two really conservative authors in the long list. One of them is Dr. James Orr, whose monumental work, "The Problem of the Old Testament," is once alluded to; but even here the reference is a very casual and unimportant one. The other conservative book, once cited, is Sir William Ramsay's "Cities of St. Paul"—a work with which we are not acquainted, but which, if we may judge from his other and more recent books, is likely to be conservative. However, it must be remembered that Ram-



say was once a liberal critic, but more thorough investigation converted him to the conservative position. (See his last book, 1916, on Archaeology and the New Testament.)

Among the critical authors cited by Dr. Sanders are the following: Cheyne, Driver, Kent, George Adam Smith, Gray (T. B.), Skinner, Ryle, Cornill, Wade, McFadyen, Mitchell, Hastings, Budde, Kennedy and Riggs. This is certainly a liberal list of liberals. These works are not only cited, but a number of them receive special commendation. For instance: "For a scholarly and helpful discussion of the origin of the ideas of these chapters (Gen. I-XI), see Jastrow, 'Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions,' 1914; Ryle, 'The Early Narratives of Genesis,' 1890," etc. Also: "The most helpful commentary is that by Driver (Westminster Comm.)"

This list is as remarkable for what it excludes as for what it includes. As we have said, with possibly two exceptions (and those referred to on nothing vital), all the authors belong to the "liberal" camp. All of them go on the assumption that much of the Old Testament is composed of myth, legend, folk-lore and tradition, even where the Bible, at least on the surface, gives plain historical narratives. All of them tell us that the Old Testament contains many historical and scientific errors and contradictions, and that little or none of it can properly lay claim to direct revelation and inspiration. Practically all of these authors accept the "documentary" hypothesis, which cuts up the historical portions of the Bible into many discrepant parts. All of them, as does Dr. Sanders himself, reconstruct the Biblical history to fit it into their subjective critical views.

Here, we are compelled to say, is where this book will prove harmful in its effects upon young minds. The conclusions of these "advanced" and disintegrating critics are set forth as if they were absolutely proved; as if all modern scholarship held them; as if there could be no question about their correctness. There is not even a hint, so far as we can see, that many of the so-called "assured results" of the liberal critics are mere hypothe-



ses, with only a slender basis of truth, if any, and that conservative scholars have again and again questioned and discredited them, and that with powerful arguments. The following great conservative writers are never even mentioned by Dr. Sanders, but are treated as if they were *non ens*: Hengstenberg, Havernick, Klostermann, Orelli, Oettli, Hommel, Moeller, Koehler, Bissell, Robertson (James), Cave, Girdlestone, Urquhart, Sayce, Watson, Lias, Blomfield, the authors of "Lex Mosaica," Redpath, Green, McGarvey, Hilprecht, Clay, Warfield, Wilson, Wiener, and many more.<sup>1</sup> If this seems pedantic, we beg pardon. We mention this long list of great names only to show the culpability of an author who ignores them, and presents as veritable truth only one side of the question in a college text-book. Is it fair, we ask in all kindness, to young collegians for an instructor in our holy religion to set forth only the liberal positions as if nothing had ever been said against them? Is that the way to arrive at the truth? Would a fair-minded, whole-hearted, and truly scientific teacher give only one side of a mooted question, and utterly ignore everything that has been said on the other side? Worse than all, not even hint that there is another side?

Let us give instances of the unfairness of such a procedure. Dr. Sanders says of Driver's work on Genesis that it is "the most helpful commentary," and constantly treats its positions as established. Is it frank for him never even to hint that Dr. Orr, in his "The Problem of the Old Testament," has called in question most of Driver's positions, and has shown again and again that other critics just as learned do not agree with Driver?

<sup>1</sup> We have another object in giving this rather formidable list of conservatives. In the last few years in this country there has been a veritable propaganda of liberal views. These views have been popularized by a number of rather spicy writers who have simply accepted offhand the views of Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Driver and Cheyne, and a special effort has been made to get these books into circulation. Many persons have become more or less acquainted with this liberal output, but have not seen or read or even heard of the deeper, solider, more finely argued works that have been published on the conservative side. We wish to call attention to these scholarly works, so that men may study both sides of the question.

Why did not Dr. Sanders tell his readers that Dr. Henry A. Redpath has written a compact (and to our mind a convincing) rejoinder to Driver in his little book, "Modern Criticism and Genesis," second and revised edition, 1906? When our author recommends Skinner's commentary on Genesis, is he treating his readers and students squarely not to tell them that Harold M. Wiener has, in the opinion of many scholars, effectually demolished Skinner? Why does not Dr. Sanders let his readers know that President Samuel C. Bartlett, D.D., in his "The Veracity of the Hexateuch," has presented a crushing answer to all of Driver's works published up to 1895? When Dr. Sanders, following his masters, Kent, Riggs, Bevan, and McFadyen, assigns the book of Daniel to 166 B. C., centuries after the Bible Daniel's time, why does he not have the grace and frankness to say that Dr. John Urquhart, in his "The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures," offered a most powerful argument for the traditional view of the book in question? Nor is it right for Dr. Sanders to overlook what Dr. Wilson, of Princeton, has done in defending the conservative view of Daniel. While Dr. Sanders himself accepts offhand the fragmentary theory of the Pentateuch, is it right for him never to tell his readers that great scholars like William Henry Green did not, and many others do not now, hold that hypothesis? When he avers without proof that Moses could not have put the Hexateuch (he means the Pentateuch) into its present form (page 13), we think he ought to tell his students that great scholars like Orr, Cave, Moeller, Green, Urquhart, Lias, Watson, Robertson, and McGarvey, do believe that Moses was the author of the first *five* books of the Bible (except, of course, the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which may have been added by Joshua).

We humbly and gently ask, Is this habit of ignoring the works of conservative scholars ethical? We have acquaintance with quite a number of conservative teachers of the Bible in various colleges and seminaries, but we do not know of one who ignores the works of the radical critics. Their method is to present both sides of the



question, and then to try to prove what they honestly believe to be the true position. Just so our conservative writers never ignore the arguments of the radicals, but examine them critically to see whether they are sound or not. Therefore we maintain that conservative scholars are broader and fairer than their opponents, and are, at the same time, their peers in scholarship.

Our next object will be to show Dr. Sanders' fundamental position on the doctrine of the Bible itself (the science of Bibliology). Does his view of the Bible agree with what the Bible claims for itself and with the well-known evangelical view? Here we shall quote, beginning on page 4: "The most important contribution made by the Hebrew nation to the world was *its interpretation* of religion. More clearly than any other known people in the centuries preceding the Christian era the Hebrews *thought of God* as a moral being, a character, the Father of mankind, who rules the world in righteousness and wishes to have it pervaded by goodness and friendliness." In our quotations we shall italicise the words that are significant and that afford a clue to the more or less disguised unevangelical views of the author. The above sentence has its good points, and is very different from the assaults of Bade. However, it does not express the Biblical view nor the evangelical view. The Bible nowhere indicates that it sets forth the Hebraic "interpretation" of religion, but always God's *revelation* of religion. This is also the evangelical view. The Bible does not teach what the "Hebrews *thought of God*," but what God *revealed* Himself to them to be; which is also the evangelical conviction.

On page 23, section 32, our author says: "In the first eleven chapters of Genesis we find a group of *stories* which convey the *ideas* of the Hebrew people concerning the creation of the world, the beginnings of human life, the conditions of primitive humanity," etc. "These *ideas* for the most part they evidently *inherited* from their Semitic forefathers and adopted without serious question. Such *ideas* have their proper place in the Bible, not because God wished to make a *special revela-*

*tion* concerning such facts, but because, through these *beliefs* of the people, correct *ideas* regarding God, man, the universe, and their mutual relations could be established."

Here again the evangelical view is different, holding that these chapters contain special divine revelations, and not merely the "beliefs" and "ideas" of the Hebrew people. If the first chapter of Genesis contains only a record of Semitic "beliefs" and "ideas," how can we be sure that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth?" If it does not correctly describe "the process of creation," as Dr. Sanders intimates on page 24, why should we accept its statement about the creation itself? Could it state a profound and infallible truth in the first verse, and then drop into crude error in the verses that immediately follow? How are you going to know which statements are true and which are not? "Oh! reason teaches us that the first verse is true, but that the rest cannot be," the critic replies. But that is rationalism, not Biblical and evangelical Christianity. In view of the innumerable egregious and harmful blunders that human reason has made in the past, and is making today, does it inspire much confidence in itself as a sure guide? The reason of Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius, Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Tyndal, Huxley, and Spencer did not lead them to believe in the doctrine of divine creation. Nor does the reason of Haeckel, Vogt and Feuerbach today convince them of such a conception. The difficulty with such views is that they simply destroy the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible in any and all of its parts.

Here, then, is our author's fundamental conception of the Bible—it is a record of human "ideas" and "beliefs," many of them wrong, some of them right. Sometimes the author uses the word "revelation"—but very sparingly—never, though, in the objective and infallible sense, but only in the subjective sense, which permits of almost any amount of the admixture of human error. To our mind, such a revelation is only a little better than none at all, and only that of natural theology. Without arguing



the question now, we submit to the Christian people of the land whether they want their sons and daughters to receive such teaching when they send them to college. If they do, that is their option; this is a free country; but they should at least be made aware of the real inner character of the instruction.

Next we must investigate Dr. Sanders' teaching on the historicity of the Bible. The threads of truth and error are so closely and deftly woven together that it is difficult to separate them. Many objectionable sentences and phrases might be cited from the "Introductory Studies," but we shall begin with page 23, where the author comes out a little more into the open. He says: "The history of the Hebrew people *really begins* with the crossing of the Jordan River and the conquest and settlement of Canaan as a permanent home." Yes, according to Cheyne, Driver, Skirner, Gray, Kent, McFadyen, etc., but not according to the Bible. According to the Bible, the history of the Hebrew people began with the call of Abraham, who was separated by the Almighty from the rest of mankind to become the father of His "chosen people." The record of events from Abraham to the crossing of the Jordan bears just as distinct a historical atmosphere, just as much an impression of verisimilitude, as does the record afterward. Note the *aplomb* of the author. He is simply cocksure. He gives no clue to the fact that the following great scholars are against his opinion that Israelitish history began when he says it did: Keil, Delitsch, Klostermann, Orelli, Moeller, Orr, Cave, Green, Lias, Watson, and scores of others. An author has no right to pretend that there is unanimity of opinion among scholars on such a mooted point.

Our author continues (note the adroitness of his language): "For hundreds of years before the entrance into Canaan, however, the Hebrew people were in making. Our knowledge of this period is *very scanty*." We hope one of Dr. Sanders' innocent students will ask him why it is so "scanty." There is a pretty full and detailed history given in the Pentateuch. Observe what follows: "What we do know about it is derived from the first five

Biblical books, Genesis to Deuteronomy, and mainly from Genesis and Exodus." Why not the other books "mainly" as well as these two? Continuing: "Like *every* history of the beginnings of a race, it is told in the form of *stories*, which explain the origin of its institutions and describe its great leaders. Such *stories* are fascinating in their interest. They are the material out of which *we make history*, but their greater value as Biblical material lies in their portrayal of strong, true types of character and in their emphasis upon God's share in human affairs."

This evasive, half-*quasi* way of saying things is what we do not like in the class of writers to which our author belongs. Why do they not come out plainly and say they do not believe that the first five books of the Bible are historical, but are largely made up of traditions and folk-stories? Is this equivocal method adopted for an ulterior purpose? Look at the above. This history "is told in the form of *stories*." But there are true and untrue stories. So here is a word used that has a double meaning. It looks as if he means that these stories are fictions. He says "like *every* history of the beginnings of a race." This would seem to indicate that the Biblical "stories" are just like those of other nations. Then what is there to make the Bible a unique book, and a special revelation of God's character, works and redeeming grace? But out of such material as these "stories" "we make history." That means that the stories are not history, but we must take them and disentangle from them the few threads of truth they contain. That is what it means, or it has no meaning. And that means again that we today, living over four thousand years after the events, must "make history" out of the tangle. What becomes of any special divine revelation from such a medley of fiction and truth? Yet this author proceeds to state that the greater value of this Biblical material lies "in their emphasis upon God's share in human affairs." But if the majority of the events never occurred, how can you prove from them that God has much share in "human affairs?" As we have said at other times, the difficulty



with the rationalists is rather with their heads than with their hearts. Our perusal of many authors leads us to think that the rationalists are the poorest reasoners in the world.

Note again on page 24 (he is speaking of the early chapters of Genesis) : "Nor do they, except in a *symbolic* way, throw light upon the exact method of man's creation or upon the origin of human occupations. God has given men the opportunity of discovering such facts for themselves. His message to the world through these *stories* was a *religious* message."

That word "symbolic" is *a la* the Cheyne-Driver-Kent school, but not according to their equals, if not superiors, Orr, Cave, Robertson, Urquhart, Green and Redpath. One of these references is to the Biblical account of the creation of man. If that narrative is "symbolical," in what way is it so? What are the points of comparison? The Genetical record is: "And Jehovah Elohim formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." In what way is that a symbolical account? It is easy to give the interpretation of the parables of Uriah's ewe lamb and of the prodigal son; but we wish some liberal critic would give us the precise interpretation of this "symbolical" story of man's creation. A good symbol ought not to be difficult to explain. Nor can we see why the Biblical writer should here used symbolical speech in describing the genesis of the human family. Of all places in the world, this would be about the most unsuitable one to use figures of rhetoric, instead of plain, literal prose. It is very poor symbolism, too, if that is what it is; for thus far it has led the vast majority of Jews and Christians to believe that it is literal history. Only a crude, not to say a dishonest, writer would write like that. Then what becomes of the "religious" value of such a bungling writer? However, if it is true history, and gives a true account of the beautiful, gracious, condescending way in which God brought man into being in His own image, then indeed is its *religious* value beyond computation.

Our author also contends that God has given men the ability to discover such facts as "the exact method of man's creation." We wonder when men have made that marvellous discovery. It must have been very recently. There are many guesses and hypotheses, but every true and modest scientist will tell you that no one today knows just the precise method of man's origin. Some of the radical critics ought to read the latest testimonies of science. Quite recently one of the greatest scientists of Germany declared that, so far as science is concerned, the origin of man is wrapped in complete obscurity; science has no positive knowledge on the subject. If man's origin is wrapped in obscurity, what do we know about the purpose of his being and about his destiny? But thanks be to God, the Bible tells us clearly and beautifully about his origin, his purpose and his destiny. This gives real meaning to life.

On page 25 Dr. Sanders gives his idea of the first chapter of Genesis. "This wonderful narrative," he says, "is really a stately *poem* about God." We are glad to note that our writer expresses here and there seemingly real heartfelt admiration for the Bible. In this respect he manifests a much better spirit than some of his fellow-writers who accept theoretically the same positions he occupies. However, here we note that what he formerly called a "story" he now calls a "poem." Of course, a poem may be a story too; yet it does seem that he is ready to call this part of the Bible almost anything but a history. He continues: "It depicts an orderly, gradual process of creation under the guidance of God and in accordance with His will. But God and man, rather than the creative process, are the centers of real interest. The poem shows in dignified fashion how the whole universe finds its explanation in God."

Every evangelical believer will be glad for these tributes. Of course Dr. Sanders is a theist. No one would ever accuse him of being a materialist. Nevertheless, he picks and chooses among the statements of the Bible, as when he intimates above that we need not accept the Biblical statements about "the process of creation," but need



only accept what is said about "God and man." So again it is human reason, not the Bible, that is the final judge. Afterwards he says that the "three great verses" of this first chapter of the Bible are the first, the 27th and the 31st, and some would add the 28th. But why make this distinction? Why not accept all the verses? Was not the getting of the earth into a habitable condition, so that man could dwell upon it and have communion with God,—was this not also of "religious" value? If our author should reply that "the process of creation" described here is not in harmony with science, we would ask, Whose science? That of Agassiz, Dana, Dawson and Quenstedt, or that of Haeckel, Vogt and Feuerbach?

Coming to the "story" of man's creation in Gen. 2:4-24, our writer remarks: "It answers, in the simple, pictorial form used by *primitive minds*, the question of the origin of human life." So it was only another of the "ideas" of the Hebrews. Again there is no revelation here; merely human ways of looking at things. The divinity of the book fades out almost to the vanishing point. See how he volatilizes everything into mere "symbolism"; a Christian Scientist could not do it much better: "But the garden of Eden was more a *symbol* than a geographical location" (page 26). It means that God gave man every chance to exercise his powers and gratify his needs. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil signifies that man was not only to work and enjoy himself, but must also attain moral good, and so have a test. True manhood consists in free moral agency. Likewise, "the beautiful *story* of the creation of woman *symbolizes* the true relationship of the sexes, the natural dependence of woman upon man, her fitness to share life with him, and the wonderful closeness of union in true marriage."

This effort comes about as near interpreting the "symbolism," if that is what it is, as any attempt we have yet seen. It is a revival of the old allegorical method of Origen, and has a touch of Swedenborgianism and Christian Science as well. By that method of hermeneutics you can find almost anything you want to in the historical narratives of the Bible. But we fear it will not an-

swer for scientific theology and interpretation. It is reading very profound moral and spiritual truths into the story. But if this chapter is only "the simple, pictorial form used by *primitive* minds," we wonder how such untutored minds could write "poems" and "stories" teaching such fine and exalted truths. We are sure that would not agree with the theory of evolution, which makes man with the "primitive mind" only a little grade higher than the ape. If you say it was divine inspiration that produced, through those "primitive minds," these stories and poems, then we do not see why the divine Spirit did not lead the writers to narrate the process of human creation as it actually occurred. Why did the Spirit select a rhetorical form that has been mistaken for actual history by the vast majority of Jews and Christians through all the centuries? If man and woman were not brought into being as the Bible says, could not the inspiring Spirit of God just as well have told the truth as to make up this beautiful piece of fiction? On the other hand, if the narrative is not divinely inspired, then the thoughts symbolized are far too deep and high for the minds of primeval savages. However, if the narrative is accepted at its face value, and is the product of divine inspiration, both the form and the teaching are accounted for, and come down to us duly authorized.

The story of the fall of our first parents into sin is likewise vaporized into symbol or parable, but we cannot tarry here. In other writings we have endeavored to prove the historicity of this narrative (see "The Rational Test," Chapter V). Next we note that Dr. Sanders omits, without a word of explanation, the whole Biblical account from Adam to the flood. Was not this an evasion? Is that the way for a true and honest teacher of religion to treat the Bible? In spite of the great diversity of opinion on the subject, our author says the "story of the flood is of Babylonian origin." Is it right for him to keep his readers and students in ignorance of the fact that many great scholars think that the Genetical account of the flood is the original inspired history of that catastrophe, while the Babylonian story is a later



perversion of it? And why should not such be the case? According to the Bible, Abraham, the Babylonians and all other people of the time were the descendants of Noah; and therefore, if Abraham was really chosen of God to be His representative, the father of His people, and the Bearer of His redemptive plan, God could easily have kept the facts of the flood pure and uncorrupted in His servant's hands. This hypothesis will adequately account for the fact that the Biblical narrative, both in purpose and manner, is *toto coelo* above that of the Babylonians. (See Dr. George A. Barton's "Archeology and the Bible," 1916.)

It is a pleasure to admit here that Dr. Sanders, instead of finding fault with God for sending the flood, as Dr. Bade does, justifies God in thus punishing the wicked world. While we are glad he does this, we think the force of the moral lesson he derives is largely lost if the flood was not a real historic occurrence. Fiction may have its use for more or less superficial people; but those who think a little more deeply will be likely to say: "Oh! but the incident never took place; it is only a bit of imagination." We cannot agree with the author when he grows almost eloquent over the "pedagogical fitness" (page 30) of this symbolical method of conveying religious instruction. If the writer or writers, inspired or uninspired, wanted to teach by parables, they should have given their literary productions the parabolic cast and form. They were not ethical, therefore, in using the historic form, and thus deceiving the vast majority of Bible students. Fiction is not the solid, deep and permanent form of instruction, and for real pedagogical value is not to be compared with facts. Moreover, it is inconsistent to think that God would give to the world a real religion, meant for their highest temporal and eternal welfare, and yet would separate it from the stream of human history, and hang it up in the air in the form of fictitious stories. While we believe that God cares for the more lightsome moods of human life, yet we cannot help believing that, when He is dealing in matters of revelation which involve human redemption from sin and eternal

death, He would use the more serious and perduring pedagogical methods.

Our writer pursues the same course throughout his book in dealing with the historical records of the Bible. Nowhere can he accept the Bible at its face value. While he differs from the more radical critics in defending the teaching of the Bible—and for this we again commend him—he otherwise accepts their premises and conclusions. The patriarchs are rather nebulous characters in his hands; the Bible representations are “idealized portraits” (page 31); sometimes they seem to have a little historic reality; then they vapor off into tribal movements again. They shimmer and glance before you, but will not remain still and steady enough for you to get your camera focused upon them. Not so does the *Bible* represent them. But that boots little with the rationalists. With them, not the Bible, but their theories are decisive.

Dr. Sanders’ treatment of Moses is no more satisfactory. This great character, so firmly drawn in the Bible, flits almost like a shadow across our author’s pages. He seems to treat him as an actual historical character, and yet nowhere does he say so plainly, and thus we are left in doubt as to whether he is much more than an idealized hero of a fiction-producing age. For instance, he says (page 67): “The casual references of these narratives to Moses are interesting.” When you remember how boldly Moses stands out in the Biblical account, from the beginning of Exodus to the close of Deuteronomy, you wonder at the carelessness of such a remark. The author himself goes on to mention quite a number of very definite things that are ascribed to Moses, showing that the references to him were far from “casual.” Then he actually stops to eulogize Moses, but whether he means a real Moses or a fictitious Moses, deponent sayeth not. At the close of this section (page 68) he says: “It is not strange that Jewish *tradition* spoke of him in superlatives (Deut. 34:10-12), and loved to refer to him as ‘Jehovah’s servant’ (Deut. 34:5) and as ‘the man of God’ (Ezra 3:2; Ps. 90:1).” So it is everywhere—“tradition,” “story,”



"folk-lore," "symbolism," "idealization," "parable," "Hebrew ideas," "poetry," "popular tales," "primitive ideas"—yes, everything but what the evangelical believer wants and needs: history, fact, revelation, inspiration. And we are bound to say that you find almost everything in this professed "History of the Hebrews" but the history itself! If that is not rationalism we beg to know what is! With one breath the author tries to hold on to the Bible; with the next he spoils it all by trying to undermine its inspiration and authority.

Before we close, let us give a sample of his method of treating miracles, just to see what a past-master he is in "making" history instead of faithfully recording it. The miracles of crossing the Jordan and the fall of Jericho are handled in this free and easy way (pages 78, 79) :

"These two events were of first importance in the story of the Hebrew people." Note, "events" and "story." Can you get any determinate kind of teaching out of such use of language? "Hebrew poets and story tellers loved to recount the thrilling episodes which introduced the acquisition of their national home. God's share in the task was very clear to them." What a free use of his Biblical material? Where does he read that they were given to telling these marvellous tales? Perhaps they were, but where does the Bible say so? Then: "As in the case of the narrative of the Deliverance (section 114), the *story* of the crossing of the Jordan is a combination of more than one earlier account of the event. One of these, apparently the earliest, was relatively straightforward and simple. It represented Joshua as encouraging the people to expect aid of Jehovah in their emergency, and declared that, at a time when the crossing was unanticipated (3:15) by the Canaanites and unopposed, something happened far up the river, perhaps a distant land slide, which dammed the river temporarily, and left its bed exposed, so that the Israelites got across. The other narrative greatly magnified Joshua (3:7, 8; 4:9, 10. 14) and the part played by the priests and the sacred ark. It also seemed to state that the water of the Jordan stood just above the pathway of Israel like a wall (3:16a)."



Of course, we cannot now presume to use the space to make a refutation of this position. Our purpose is rather to show clearly this author's free and liberal way of handling the Biblical records instead of accepting them at their face value. However, if he had done the fair thing he would have said that Lange and Keil do not accept the explanation here given, nor admit that the narrative is made up of several contradictory "earlier accounts." Besides, he should have known and explained that Prof. George Frederick Wright made first-hand investigations in the valley of the Jordan, and gives a lucid explanation of how the waters may have been parted, just as the Bible says, by God's miraculous use of secondary forces, just as He used the wind in the case of the parting of the Red Sea and the bringing of the quails in the wilderness. (See Wright's "Scientific Confirmations of the Old Testament," 1906, pages 130-144.) Here we merely pause to remark that, if our author uses so free a hand in getting rid of the supernatural in the Bible, is there no danger that its *religious* authority may be invalidated?

Just one more specimen (page 79): "In the *story* of the capture of Jericho the *oldest* narrative stated that the little army marched around the city in silence for six days, then captured it with a *cheer* and a *sudden dash*. Such tactics agree with Joshua's generalship in other battles (8:10:21; 10:9). Whether the sudden collapse of the city walls is to be explained by a divinely ordered earthquake, or figuratively as an expression of the astonishing ease with which it was captured, no one can surely say."

We would advise one of this professor's students to ask him what the *Bible* says about this event, and that in the plainest and most vivid language. Note that our author *hints*—that is the worst of it, *hints*—that there were extant several contradictory accounts of Jericho's fall. That is what he means when he speaks about the "oldest" account. What becomes of the doctrine of the inspiration of the Old Testament in such hands? How can a book



containing so many crude errors be a book of *religious* value, to say nothing of religious authority?

The limits of space, and perhaps the editor's patience, too, forbid our pursuing the subject further. Our purpose in conducting this study and offering these strictures has not been primarily Biblical Criticism, but Apologetics, which, with Dogmatics, is our special department. Whenever Biblical Criticism seeks to undermine the integrity and authority of the Biblical records and undertakes to pronounce upon the doctrine of inspiration, it invades the department of both Apologetics and Dogmatics, and therefore cannot be permitted to go unnoticed and uncensored. In the Lutheran Church especially, where we look upon the Word of God as the chief means of grace, it behooves us to defend the integrity and inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures.

*Hamma Divinity School,  
Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE IV.

## EARLY LUTHERAN MISSIONS.

BY ELSIE SINGMASTER LEWARS.

The interest of Luther in missions has been the subject of much unnecessary discussion. There are fervent admirers who claim for him a missionary enthusiasm which he did not possess. There are others who deny for him all interest in this vital question. The truth lies midway.

Missionary enterprise was not one of the first activities of the new Church, nor was it to be expected that it should be. The turmoil and difficulties connected with the establishment of the evangelical religion occupied fully the minds of the reformers. Germany was practically an inland nation and a divided nation. It had no ships, no foreign possessions, no communication with the heathen world. There were not for the early Protestants as for the early Christians great Roman roads leading the imagination afar, there were no large cities where men of many nations touched elbows. The newly discovered lands were the possession of Catholic countries in whose domain the new Gospel, which was really the old Gospel, would have had no hearing.

Not only Luther but other reformers in other lands were concerned chiefly with the heathenized Church about them. For it they labored and prayed. The business of laying a sound foundation absorbed them. That the foundation was well laid, the missions of later centuries will show. In the words of Doctor Gustav Warneck: "*The Reformation not only restored the true substance of missionary preaching by its earnest proclamation of the Gospel, but also brought back the whole work of missions to Apostolic lines.*"

There is always a difference of opinion about the actual beginnings of a great work. Modern missions offer no exception to this rule. General historians are unwilling



to find any indication that even in the Seventeenth Century the Church of the Reformation felt an obligation to heathen nations. Lutheran historians, searching the matter more thoroughly and with a less prejudiced spirit, have discovered various individuals to whom missions were a matter of deep concern.

As early as 1557, *Primus Truber* translated into the language of the Croats and Wends to the east of Germany the Gospel, Luther's Catechism and a book of spiritual songs. In 1559, Gustavus Vasa, King of Sweden, and later Gustavus Adolphus, endeavored to bring into the Lutheran Church the Lapps, who, though nominally Roman Catholic, had been in reality heathen, but the effort was not successful. Denmark, which had acquired possessions in India, provided for a minister to the colony, whose chief concern should be the spiritual needs of the natives. The creditable undertaking was brought to naught by the wickedness of the appointed ministers. In 1658, *Eric Bredal*, a Norwegian bishop began preaching to the Lapps. Some of his assistants were killed; he died, and his work came to no earthly fruitage. But the missionary spirit was none the less clearly exhibited.

In 1634 *Peter Heiling* of Lübeck journeyed to Abyssinia to try to rouse once more the churches of the East whose spiritual life had almost ceased. There, after translating the New Testament into Amharic, he died a martyr.

In 1638 the Swedes established "New Sweden" on the banks of the Delaware River in America. That there existed in their minds an interest in the spiritual welfare of the Indians surrounding them is recorded in one of the resolutions for the government of the colony. "The wild nations bordering upon all other sides, the Governor shall understand how to treat with all humanity and respect, that no violence or wrong be done them. . . . but he shall rather, at every opportunity exert himself that the same wild people may gradually be instructed in the truths and worship of the Christian religion, and in other ways be brought to civilization and good government, and in this

manner properly guided." Among the Swedish Lutheran pastors who obeyed this injunction was *John Campanius* who translated in 1648 Luther's Catechism into the language of the Virginia Indians, a work which antedated by thirteen years the publication of John Eliot's translation of the New Testament for the Indians of Massachusetts. The work among the Indians lasted for over a hundred years.

The most important name of the Seventeenth Century in Lutheran missions is that of *Justinian von Welz*, a German nobleman. To him there came clearly the true vision of the indissoluble relation of living Christianity and Christian missions. In 1664 he issued two pamphlets, one bearing the title, "*An invitation for a society of Jesus to promote Christianity and the conversion of heathendom,*" the other "*A Christian and true-hearted exhortation to all right-believing Christians of the Augsburg Confession respecting a special association by means of which, with God's help, our evangelical religion might be extended.*" In the latter pamphlet there were such questions as these: "Is it right that we evangelical Christians hold the Gospel for ourselves alone?" "Is it right that in all places we have so many theological students, and do not induce them to labor elsewhere in the garden of the Lord?" "Is it right that we evangelical Christians expend so much on all sorts of dress, delicacies in eating and drinking, etc., but have hitherto thought of no means for the spread of the Gospel?"

When this appeal was met with opposition and ridicule, von Welz issued a still stronger manifesto. He called upon the court preachers, the learned professors and others in authority to establish a missionary school where oriental languages, the lives of the early missionaries, geography and kindred missionary subjects might be studied. Alas! von Welz was considered now more fanatical and insane than before. When he suggested the sending out of artisans and laymen to tell the Gospel story, since the learned and influential leaders would not go, he was thought to be quite mad.



Forsaking his noble rank, this eager soul turned away from his own country to Holland, where he found a minister to ordain him as "an apostle to the Gentiles." Arranging his affairs so that all his wealth might be applied to his great endeavor, he set sail as a missionary to Dutch Guiana in South America. There in a few months he found a lonely grave.

In Justianian von Welz the Church of the Reformation possesses one of her worthiest and least known heroes. It was not until 1786, more than a century later, that the Baptist William Carey, considered the first standard bearer of modern missions, lifted up his admonishing voice. Of von Welz, Doctor Warneck, the greatest of all missionary historians, speaks thus: "The indubitable sincerity of his purposes, the noble enthusiasm of his heart, the sacrifice of his position, his fortune, his life for the yet unrecognized duty of the Church to missions, insure for him an abiding place of honor in missionary history." To him another German missionary historian pays this tribute: "Sometimes in a mild December a snow drop lifts its head, yet is spring far away. Frost and snow will hold field and garden in chains for many months. But have patience. Only a little while and Spring will be here!"

Von Welz's labors and prayers were to bear fruit. His teaching sank into the hearts of some of those who read. In a period of dreary rationalism which followed there began to spring up the seeds which he had sowed. Missions became more and more a subject of discussion among learned men. Among those who gave the theories of von Welz his earnest attention was the German scientist Leibnitz who urged the sending of missionaries to China through Russia. When men began not only to think and to discuss but to pray, the Spring was really at hand.

To two Lutherans above all other men the world owes the impulse to modern Protestant missions. If Philip Jacob Spener and August Herman Francke had not lived,

the preaching of the pure Gospel to the heathen, already long delayed, would have had a still later Spring.

*Philip Spener* was born in 1635 and died in 1705. He was a man of deep piety and great learning. Occupying many important positions, among them that of court preacher at Dresden, he preached and taught constantly that pure living must be added to pure doctrine, urging that the "rigid and externalized" orthodoxy of the Church be transmuted into practical piety which should include Bible study and all sorts of Christian work. He held in his own house meetings for the study of the Bible and the exchanging of personal religious experiences. From the name of these meetings, *collegia pietatis*, the name of Pietists was given in ridicule to him and his followers.

Among the practical manifestations of a true Christian spirit which Spener urged was the sending of missionaries to the heathen. On the Feast of the Ascension he preached as follows:

"We are thus reminded that although every preacher is not bound to go everywhere and preach, since God has knit each of us to his congregation, yet the obligation rests on the whole Church to have care as to how the Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, and that to this end no diligence, labor, or cost be spared in behalf of the poor heathen and unbelievers. That almost no thought has been given to this, and that great potentates, as the earthly heads of the Church, do so very little therein, is not to be excused, but is evidence how little the honor of Christ and of humanity concerns us; yea, I fear that in that day unbelievers will cry for vengeance upon Christians who have been so utterly without care for their salvation."

Most famous among the followers and admirers of Spener was *August Herman Francke*, who was born in 1663 and died in 1727. He showed as a child extraordinary powers of mind, being prepared to enter the university at the age of fourteen. In 1685 he graduated from the University of Leipsic after having studied there and



at Erfurt and Kiel. In 1688 he spent two months with Spener at Dresden and became deeply impressed with pietistic theories. In 1691 he was appointed professor of Greek and Oriental languages in the University of Halle, then recently founded. Here he became pastor of a church in a neighboring village, an undertaking which was to have world-wide importance.

The villagers in this town of Glaucha were degraded, poor, untaught. Moved by their need, Francke opened a school for the children in one room. He had little money but he trusted God. In a short while it was necessary to add another room, then two. He next established a home for orphans, then he added homes for the destitute and fallen. As fast as his enterprises increased, so rapidly came the necessary support.

It is not possible to tell here the amazing history of the Halle institutions which sheltered even before the death of Francke more than a thousand souls, much less of the enormous Inner Mission institutions in other parts of Germany which had here their inspiration. That activity of this remarkable man with which we are chiefly concerned is his missionary labors. In the words of Doctor Warneck: "He knew himself to be a debtor to both Christians and non-Christians. In him there is personified that connection of rescue work at home with missions to the heathen—a type of the fact that they who do the one do not leave the other undone. Home and foreign missions have from the beginning been sisters who work reciprocally into each other's hands."

Francke's institution became a training school for Christian workers. There was no specific instruction for such undertakings, but "in those that came in near contact with him he stirred a spirit of absolute devotion to divine service, such as he himself possessed in highest measure, and which made them ready to go wherever there was need of them." There came into the school later, as a lad, the Moravian Zinzendorf, afterwards a zealous missionary, who described thus the effect of the surroundings upon him: "The daily opportunity in Pro-

fessor Francke's house of hearing edifying tidings of the kingdom of Christ, of speaking with witnesses from all lands, of making acquaintance with missionaries, of seeing men who had been banished and imprisoned, as also the institutions then in their bloom, and the cheerfulness of the pious man himself in the work of the Lord..... mightily strengthened within me zeal for the things of the Lord."

From Halle there went forth during the following century about sixty missionaries, among them Ziegenbalg, Fabricus, Jaenicke, Gericke and Schwartz. Here also was trained Muhlenberg, the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America, who intended first to go as a missionary to India. Here were published in 1710 the earliest missionary reports in a little periodical which was continued under different titles until 1880, one hundred and seventy years. Among those for whom the heart of Francke yearned were the Jews, in whose interest he founded the *Institutum Judaicum*. From Halle there spread an influence not only through Germany but through the world which is difficult to estimate but almost impossible to exaggerate. By no means the least of the missionary activities which had there their inspiration was that of the Moravian Church, the most ardent in missionary work of all Churches.

The missionary influence did not have by any means free course. The opposition shown to the theories of Justinian von Welz continued. Francke was considered no less of a fanatic. This contrary spirit may be shown by the expression of a deeply pious clergyman who concluded an Ascension sermon with the following couplet:

" 'Go into all the world,' the Lord of old did say;

But now 'Where God has placed thee, there He would have thee stay.' "

But even in poetic form missionary activity was soon to find an expression. In Halle a Lutheran *Karl Heinrich von Bogatsky* wrote in 1750 the first Protestant missionary hymn.



“Awake, Thou Spirit, who didst fire  
The watchmen of the Church’s youth,  
Who faced the foe’s envenomed ire,  
Who witnessed day and night Thy truth,  
Whose voices loud are ringing still,  
And bringing hosts to know Thy will.

“And let Thy Word have speedy course,  
Through every land be glorified,  
Till all the heathen know its force,  
And fill Thy churches far and wide;  
Wake Israel from her sleep, O Lord,  
And spread the conquests of Thy Word!”

Before this time, however, the first call for missionary workers had come to Halle from outside Germany.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE V.

PREACHING FROM THE PERICOPE.<sup>1</sup>

BY G. ALBERT GETTY.

The practice of reading and expounding certain appointed portions of Scripture on certain days of the year is of very ancient origin. From the time of the Babylonian Captivity the custom seems to have prevailed among the Jews of reading each Sabbath day appointed passages from the law and similar passages from the prophets. For this purpose fifty-four selections were made from the Penteteuch (which were known as the *Parashas*) and a similar number from the prophetical books (which were called the *Haphtaras*). This number provided for all the Sabbaths which could possibly occur in any one year, including leap-years, and when there were but fifty-two Sabbaths in the year, some of the shorter passages were combined. By this system practically the entire law and the most important messages of the Hebrew prophets were read in each synagogue during the year. It was in all probability the law and the prophecy appointed for the day that Jesus read in the synagogue at Nazareth, when he there proclaimed himself the long promised Messiah.

Early in the history of the Christian Church the same general practice came into vogue, and there are a number of very ancient lectionaries giving tables of lessons from the New Testament to be read in Christian congregations during the year. The object in view was of course to provide that the most important passages of Scripture should in this manner be presented to the attention of the congregation, either in some logical order, or in connection with some of the festivals of the Church.

The beginnings of the pericope as we have it at the

<sup>1</sup> (Substance of an address delivered before the students of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., December 14th, 1916).



present time in the Lutheran Church, may be traced back as far as the Fifth Century. During the Middle Ages it was fully developed. In general the festivals of the Church year determined the order in which the different subjects were presented in the lessons selected, but there were other influences also at work. Rev. R. C. H. Lenski, in his *Eisenach Gospel Selections*, gives us, for example, an account of how the Fifth Sunday after Easter came to be known as "Rogate," or Prayer Sunday. He says:

"When in the year 466 as a result of earthquakes in several countries there was great distress, Bishop Claudias Mamertus of Vienna, directed that the first three days before the Ascension festival should be used for fasting, prayer, and processions in the churches and on the fields in order to call upon God to remove the distress. Gradually this custom was introduced in other places, and in 591 prescribed for the whole Christian Church. Thus Rogate Sunday became the special Prayer-Sunday of the year, and the week beginning with this Sunday the Week of Prayer."

At the time of the Reformation Luther and his colleagues modified the Roman pericope so as to make it conform to the requirements of the Evangelical Churches, but in the main it remained largely the same as it had been prior to the Reformation. It is a well known fact that in his preaching Luther followed the pericope closely, as did also many of the other Reformers.

The pericope as we have it at the present time is not entirely free from defects, but with all its faults it has such a value that it will be a long time before it is supplanted. In 1896 the Eisenach Conference of Germany adopted a series of scripture texts which might be used alternately with, or supplementary to, the older pericope. These "Eisenach Selections" were made with great care, and the table possesses great value to the preacher. The spirit of the Church Year is beautifully brought out, and the epistles especially are exceedingly rich in homiletical, doctrinal and devotional material. The writer, in order to impart variety to his pulpit work has read the Eisenach

lessons in the service instead of the regular lessons of the old pericope, for a year, returning again to the older lessons, the following year. He has also preached regularly for a year upon the Eisenach Gospels, and another year upon the Eisenach Epistles. By using the Gospels and Epistles of the old pericope and the Old Testament, Epistle, and Gospel selections of the Eisenach Series, a preacher could spend five years in solid work upon these passages of Scripture, without once repeating himself. Such a course of pulpit work would be profitable for both pastor and people.

In portions of the Lutheran Church in America there has been a wide departure from the ancient and historic practice of preaching upon the pericope. In some congregations the Church Year is not observed at all, nor are the lessons of the pericope read; in many others the regular Order of Service is used, including the Introit, Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the day, but the sermon has no connection whatever with the liturgical parts of the service; in comparatively few churches does the pastor preach regularly upon the lessons appointed for the day, although this latter practice has received the endorsement of the Christian Church for more than a thousand years and has much to commend it to the preacher.

During the past fifteen or twenty years the writer has learned to appreciate the value of the pericope for pulpit work and he desires to call attention to some of the advantages of preaching regularly upon the gospels or epistles for each Sunday and festival of the Church Year.

1. The preacher who, beginning with Advent, determines that he will preach every Sunday morning upon, say, the gospel for the day, is saved the loss of time which is often wasted in casting about for a text. Many preachers spend the best part of the week selecting their topic or text, and when their minds become settled as to the theme of the Sunday morning sermon, there is little time left in which to prepare it. The preacher who is following the pericope, knows when he enters his study on Tuesday morning, or as early in the week as he finds it



convenient to begin his preparations, just what his subject is to be. At least he knows the passage of Scripture in which that subject is to be found, and he can at once apply himself to the serious work of preparation.

2. The preacher who follows the pericope faithfully will be compelled to present to his people a full-rounded system of truth. He will not preach upon topics which are attractive to himself alone, but will be compelled to preach upon topics which he would otherwise avoid. Not long since the writer asked one of his brethren in the ministry "When did you preach last upon the Second Coming of our Lord?" to which there came the reply, "I do not know that I have ever made that the theme of a sermon." Yet this is a subject about which our people are thinking, and about which there is a great deal of error current in the world at the present time. He who follows the pericope will find it difficult to dodge this subject as it is the theme of the Gospel for the Second Sunday in Advent.

3. The preacher who is to present such subjects to his people will find that it requires diligent study on his part but this study will be a great benefit to him rounding out his own knowledge of Christian truth. He will be driven again and again to his text books and his commentators, but the process will be profitable both to him and to his people.

4. Systematic work appeals to the people and tends to keep their interest alive. This is shown clearly when special series of sermons are announced, or during the special services which are often held during the Lenten season. Those who hear the first sermon or attend the first service, usually feel that they would like to follow the course through to the end, and the same is more or less true of the congregation that becomes interested in their pastor's systematic preaching upon the pericope.

5. A very important consideration which the preacher would do well to note, is that by preaching upon the lessons for the day he will impart a unity to the entire service which is impossible otherwise. The note sounded in the Introit becomes more clear in the Collect and comes

out in a chord of delightful harmony in the Epistle and Gospel. This note ought to be preserved in the sermon, in order that the general effect may be not only pleasing, but that the lesson of the day may be clearly and firmly pressed home upon the hearts of the worshippers. In this connection I may say to those who have not yet begun the study of the pericopes, but who intend to do so, that the real theme of the entire service is very often beautifully brought out in the brief phrases of the Collect.

6. Christian truth is presented at the most opportune time by the preacher who follows the pericope. The finest sermon that the writer ever heard delivered upon the theme of the Resurrection was delivered by a Presbyterian minister on the Sunday before Christmas. It is needless to say that its force was entirely lost because the minds of the people just then were filled with thoughts of the Nativity. The preacher who follows the pericope will not fall into any such error, but will bring to his people the phase of Christian truth which is most opportune.

7. The general effect of following the Church Year and preaching upon the pericope is to deepen and strengthen the church life of the people. Some of the same interest which is aroused by Christmas and Easter, is aroused also by the minor festivals and special Sundays, and the centering of the people's thoughts upon the Church Year produces good results.

8. By preaching upon the pericope the pastor makes it possible for many of his people to prepare their hearts for the sermon by reading over the lessons before coming to church. Within the last few weeks a number of my own people have voluntarily told me that they were following this custom, sometimes at the family altar, sometimes in private reading, but in every case with profit.

9. The use of the pericope in the pulpit aligns our work with the great Church of the past, and with the work of all other branches of the Christian Church in the present age in which liturgical usages are followed. It is always a source of comfort to the pastor to know that



this same message which he is giving to his people is being presented at the same time from thousands of other pulpits throughout the world.

So much for the advantages of preaching from the pericope; now a few words as to the methods of handling these passages of Scripture in the pulpit. There are many who say that they are preaching upon the pericope, when as a matter of fact they have but selected a text from the appointed lesson, and are preaching upon an entirely different subject than the underlying theme of the lesson itself. The sermon upon the pericope should always be expository in character and my meaning may perhaps best be brought out by two or three illustrations.

The Gospel for the Second Day after Epiphany is the account of the Wedding at Cana, as given by St. John (2:1-11). Some years ago I preached a textual sermon upon the fifth verse of this passage, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it." The text lends itself to division very readily as follows:

1. Whatsoever *He* saith unto you, do it.
2. *Whatsoever* He saith unto you, do it.
3. Whatsoever He saith unto *you*, do it.
4. Whatsoever He saith unto you, *do it*.

I was rather pleased with my outline and with my sermon but I was not preaching upon the Gospel for the day. The key-note of this passage in connection with the Epiphany Season is to be found in the last verse: "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and *manifested forth His glory.*" "The manifestation of the glory of our Lord at Cana" would be the proper theme for the preacher who was really preaching upon the pericope.

Similarly the Gospel for the Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity is a part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 6:24-34). This passage contains a number of very fine texts for textual and topical work. Verse 24, "No man can serve two masters," suggests "The Impossibility of a Divided Service." Verse 28, "Consider the lilies of the field," might be used for a topical sermon on "The

Lilies," in which the flowers were treated as (1) Examples of Divine Skill, (2) Emblems of Purity, (3) Types of the Resurrection. But a careful reading of this passage will bring out the fact that Jesus is here seeking to teach men the truth of God's Providential Care as a Basis for their Trust in Him. The Saviour's own argument might be summarized thus:

(1) God gives the body, and he will provide for its needs.

(2) God provides for birds and flowers, he will also provide for man.

(3) God alone has the power to provide, and without him all human effort is in vain.

(4) God knows our needs, even better than do we ourselves.

These divisions in the discourse of our Lord, might well be made the divisions of an expository sermon upon the Gospel for this day.

A very satisfactory form of treatment, when it is possible, is to select a single verse from some other part of the Bible which contains the gist of the lessons for the day, and use it as a text for an expository sermon on the appointed passage. Thus the Gospel for the Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity is the account of the Healing of the Nobleman's Son (John 4:46-54). In preaching upon this passage I have used as a text Psalm 50:15, "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." The treatment has then been:

1. *An invitation*, "Call upon me," which the Nobleman may or may not have known.

2. *A promise*, "I will deliver," which was fulfilled to the Nobleman, and to all others who call.

3. *A duty*, "Thou shalt glorify," which the Nobleman performed better than do many of us today.

Here the entire material for the sermon was derived from the Gospel for the day, but was arranged under the divisions of an Old Testament text.

As to the method of preparing for pulpit work upon the pericope, I suppose that no two men follow exactly



the same plan. I have, I believe, found the method that is best for me and I present it to my younger brethren for such consideration as they may see fit to give it.

1. The Introit, Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the day should be carefully read. For this purpose I have a large blank book in which each double page is devoted to one Sunday or Festival of the Church Year. Down the left hand side of the page I have pasted the Introit and Collect for that particular day, clipped from an old Book of Worship, and also the Epistle and Gospel for the day, clipped from old Bibles. Here at a glance I have the chief elements of the service, and also such notes and references as I have occasion to make from year to year, including often the hymns used.

2. After getting the general line of thought clearly in mind, I begin my reading. For this purpose I keep one or more good books of sermons on my desk, such as Luther's Haus-Postil, Wolf's Expositions, or Seiss' Lectures on the Gospels for the Church Year. If possible I read a number of these books, analyzing what others have written on the passage, and entering the outline of their treatment in the book above mentioned.

3. Then, if points have been suggested which need further investigation I turn to the commentaries, to get doubtful matters fully cleared up in mind.

4. By this time the outline for my own pulpit work has generally assumed definite shape, and is written out carefully.

5. Then the sermon is ready to be committed to the paper, or to be delivered extempore, if that is the preacher's manner of delivering his message. Many a man commits the blunder of trying to write before his outline is clearly in mind, in other words, before he knows just what he wants to say. It is usually not a difficult thing to write or to speak, when we know exactly what we desire to express, and this often accounts for the difference between a good sermon and a poor one. There is considerable truth in the distinction made some time ago by him who said, "The poor preacher has to say some-

thing; the good one has something to say." Too much attention therefore cannot be bestowed upon the outline.

Some of the books which have helped me in my own study of the pericopes in connection with my pulpit work are the following:

On the Gospels of the old Pericope:

Luther's Haus-Postil.

Wolf's Expositions of the Gospels of the Church Year, based upon Nebe.

Seiss' Lectures on the Gospels.

Loy's Sermons on the Gospels of the Church Year.

Long's Great Gospel.

On the Epistles:

Seiss' Lectures on the Epistles.

Loy's Sermons on the Epistles.

Long's Eternal Epistle.

On the Eisenach Gospels:

R. C. H. Lenski's Eisenach Gospel Selections.

Sheatsley's Sermons on the Eisenach Gospels.

On the Eisenach Epistles:

Lenski's Eisenach Epistle Selections.

In conclusion I wish to say that there is a wide field for original study and investigation along the line of the pericopes and other kindred subjects, and it would be a fine thing indeed, if some of the young men in our seminary would select some special field of study, such as liturgics, hymnology, or the pericopes, in which to pursue their study after seminary days are over. In such a study they would find rich pleasure, and its results would be of benefit to the Church at large.

*York, Pa.*



## ARTICLE VI.

## PURITAN AND PALATINE.

BY PROFESSOR C. B. GOHDES.

In the beginning of the Seventeenth Century the brief day of Evangelical Christianity seemed to set in tempestuous night. In France the Huguenots were pressed to the wall by Richelieu. Luther's Germany had been trampled under foot by the inhuman hordes of Tilly and Wallenstein, with Gustavus Adolphus still undreamt of as deliverer. In England prelatism was foisted upon the nation by the Stuart king Charles I, and his henchmen Archbishop Laud and the Earl of Strafford. Huguenotism in France, Lutheranism in Germany, Puritanism in England, appeared doomed to annihilation. While the Episcopal Church was destined to signal a great advance upon Romanism, what spirituality England possessed in the days of the Tudors and the Stuarts took rather the shape of Nonconformity. What is the Quaker sect, for instance, but a reaction from the unspiritual, unsympathetic temper of the established Church? Tormented by a restive conscience, George Fox, the founder of the Quaker sect, went to the appointed shepherds of souls. The first made the poor lad's troubles an occasion of gossip among his servants, and Fox found himself a butt of derision in the servants' hall. The second shepherd, mixing in one prescription spiritual and narcotic constituents, prescribed the singing of psalms and a pipe of tobacco. The third applied a physic internally and leeches externally; but notwithstanding such radical remedies Fox's turbulence of conscience refused to be laid. Not yet disheartened, Fox went to a fourth priest, who promptly drove him from his premises, when in the heat of soul passion, he inadvertently stepped upon a flower-bed. What wonder that, turning to Scripture alone for guidance, the gropings of his spiritually and intellectually

untutored mind led to Quakerism as the latest form of fanaticism.<sup>1</sup> These unpromising conditions had indeed been brought about under previous reigns. The laws emanating from the unclean mind of Henry VIII, and the trumpet blasts with which Queen Elizabeth announced her supremacy in the Church of England, might ordain that whatever Majesty might command in matters of religion should be obeyed by every English subject; but neither Henry's edicts nor Elizabeth's trumpet blasts had been able to make in one day of ignorant papists and gross idolaters faithful Christians and true disciples. The spirit of the Papacy did not depart from England at the sad death of Cardinal Wolsey, a fact of which Non-conformist ministers became painfully aware when Archbishop Laud endeavored to quell their independence by having their ears lopped off and their bodies thrown into dungeons. Parliament, the stronghold of Puritan Christianity, becoming the shuttlecock between royal prejudice and royal fury, no refuge seemed left for the Puritans but the land across the sea. Twenty-five thousand Puritans followed between 1630 and 1640 the lead of the God-fearing Pilgrims of 1619, deeming the barren soil of New England more promising to freedom and soul-growth than the home country, with its license and tyranny on high, and material and spiritual distress in the lower ranks of society. Thus came to America an element of nation builders the pervasiveness of whose character has been one of the most powerful factors in the history of America—the English Puritan.

Strange that the American historian has dwelt with so little attention and sympathy upon another set of nation builders, the German Palatines. If the horror of persecution and the surrender of home and fireside; if the grappling with savage men and conditions; above all, if the deep-going and far-reaching consequences of the mi-

<sup>1</sup> Conditions in Virginia do not appear to have been much better, if we are justified in drawing conclusions from a report of Governor Berkeley. Stating that Virginia ministers were well supported, he added that their support would be even better if they would "preach less and pray more."



gration of thousands of our spiritual kinsmen and the ancestors of some of us, are factors investing them with the charm of interest and the glamor of romance, then, surely, our Lutheran Palatines should not fail of their share of recognition, at least on the part of Lutheran Americans in the year of jubilee.

Sweet in the shadow of its forests, cradled in the beauty of its hills, laved by the silver of the scenic Rhine, fragrant with the blossoms of faith that had sprung up in the hearts of its people, the Palatinate basked in the sunlight of divine favor at the end of the Seventeenth Century, fast distancing the multitudinous ills left behind by the Thirty-Years War. But there was to be no abiding peace and prosperity. Louis XIV, the idolatrous Papist and adulterous king, coveted the rich fields and castle-crowned hills of the Palatinate. That meant a war entailing the destruction of some of the fairest gems of mediaeval art in the form of churches and castles. Presently fire ravaged vineyard and orchard, field and granary. Finally the edict of exile was issued against hundreds of thousands of our brethren in the faith, which, in turn, meant the grafting upon the tree of American life of a new branch; namely, the Lutheran type of Protestant Christianity. We cannot forbear dwelling upon the grim, ghastly features that attended the insertion of this graft: no Bradford, no Winthrop, passed into liberty's light through night like this. Tender mothers sinking upon the ice in death's swoon, in their arms suckling infants; greybeards sitting down within sight of their burning homes for their last sleep; children wailing when the frost bit killing into their cheeks and eyes,—and no home in sight, save that vaulting above. We repeat: no Bradford, no Winthrop, passed into liberty's light through night such as this. We see our Palatines, three thousand of them, encamped on the Black Heath near London, objects of pity to the whole Protestant world, and especially to England's queen. We see these exiles arriving in the forests of the Hudson, eager to carve out homes from the wilderness, but doomed to servile toil in

order to liquidate the cost of their transportation. This is to be done by the manufacture of tar from trees that do not even contain all the ingredients necessary to the purpose. Ill sheltered from the cold, ill fed in spite of unceasing toil, ill treated by their English fellow Christians in spite of their tragic fate, these pioneers of American Lutheranism flee from the oppression of the white man to the friendship of the savage and the solitude of the wilderness on the Schoharie, only to be swindled out of their land by English Christians (?) under the form of law. We see some of them start out for a third time in quest of peace and homes, at last to find them under the generous sway of William Penn in Pennsylvania along the Susquehanna and Tulpehocken. Three thousand Lutheran Palatines, victims by turn of French aggression and English covetousness, came to America in the first decade of the Eighteenth Century, to be followed within half a century by over fifty thousand of their co-religionists and kinsmen.

We shall have occasion to compare the contribution made by these brethren in the faith with that of the Puritans, and to ask ourselves as Americans the question to which of the two, the spiritual descendant of the Puritan or that of the Palatine, America may look for guidance in truth and for inspiration in righteousness, now that unprecedented material prosperity is the nation's perilous lot, and the quest of the spiritual and eternal has all but faded from the vision and consciousness of the many.

Nor should we fail in this connection to make mention of the Lutheran Salzburg fugitives, who, in the providence of God, with the twice exiled Palatines became the first considerable contribution of German Lutheranism to the nascent American nation. See the Lutheran men of Salzburg enter upon a solemn covenant as dungeon and rack begin to betoken Papist rage. High upon the mountain they climb, where sky-wafted breezes, the fragrance of hemlock and fir, and the glinting snow upon Alpine height greet them as symbols of the presence of God's pure, heartening Spirit. We see them dip their hands



into the salt—pungent symbol of the pervasiveness and power of the Christian faith; and, when the tongues have touched the all but sacramental element, they send forth the vow toward heaven that no dungeon, no rack, no papal fury, shall ever swerve them from the pure faith and worship of God. We see them, as reward for their steadfastness, driven forth by Archbishop Firmian in midwinter, bereft of home and children; but going with the peace of God, the love of men, and the hope of heaven in their broken hearts. We see them, in quest of homes on the banks of the Savannah, brave the cascading seas, singing psalms of joy in answer to the fury of the storm king, witnesses of Christ by their very bearing and presence. Saints from Salzburg and martyrs from the Palatinate, were destined to be co-pioneers with the Puritans in the up-building of the American nation. Let us see which of the two, the Puritan or the Lutheran, is better qualified to stamp his faith upon the nation's life; which of the two has left such a memory of loyalty to Christ and of a character hallowed by suffering that loyalty impels us to follow in his steps.

It has been said that it was the Puritans of New England who exerted the strongest influence in the development of our American democracy. Well said, if we mean those Puritans who acted in opposition to Puritan faith. An objective, unbiased study of history will show that the Commonwealth founded by the Puritans in Massachusetts was no democracy, but an aristocratic hierocracy, constant reaction from which was necessary to establish a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, to use the racy and trenchant phrase of Lincoln. A great opportunity was there when the necessities of the new world invited to a general levelling of native rank and privilege; but the opportunity was not perceived. Nor could it, with Calvin to blaze the way to the new political venture. Calvin, who has received credit as the prophet of the great democratic nations of the present, expressed an all but contemptuous disregard of the people's right to a voice in their own government.

"For private men, who have no authority to deliberate on the regulation of any public affairs," he says, "it would be surely a vain occupation to dispute which would be the best form of government in the place where they live."<sup>2</sup> Frankly Calvin expressed himself as in favor of an aristocracy, a principle embodied by himself in the government of Geneva, in which he was the prevailing power, to the virtual exclusion of the common people. Cotton, the great preacher of Massachusetts Colony, when questioned why the franchise was restricted to church members, acknowledged, with a clearness that left nothing to be desired, that the State should accommodate itself to the Church rather than that the Church frame should accommodate itself to the civil State. "Democracy," he insisted, "I do not conceive that ever God did ordain as a fit government either for Church or Commonwealth."<sup>3</sup> It was this same Puritan divine who repressed democratic aspirations when he attempted to prove from the Word of God that the magistrates of Massachusetts Colony, who had usurped life tenure in contravention of their charter, had according to the Word of God the same right to their office as the farmer to his freehold. When, in 1643, the New England Confederation was organized, the admission of New Hampshire was protested against by Winthrop, the political leader and governor of Massachusetts, on the ground that a tailor had become the mayor of a town. The same Winthrop, a Puritan of Puritans, proclaimed that "democracy had no warrant in Scripture," and that "among nations it has always been accounted the meanest and worst of all forms of government."<sup>4</sup> It was as a reaction against such aristocratic prejudices that Connecticut was founded by Thomas Hooker; and even here the Puritan leaven showed itself when the discipline of the churches was made a duty of the legislature, and this body was empowered to lay down qualifications for Holy Communion.

2 Calvin's Institutes VIII.

3 Hutchinson's Massachusetts Bay (1765) App. III.

4 Hutchinson's History of England.



It is thought, moreover, that we owe our American principle of separation between Church and State to the Puritans. If by this is meant that a reaction from Puritanism has so eventuated, we agree; but religious freedom and Puritanism are too far apart in purpose and spirit to be child and mother. The Puritans, themselves victims of intolerance in England, as soon as they obtained power amid the totterings of the Stuart throne, passed in Parliament this resolution: "We do declare it far from our purpose to let loose the golden reins of discipline and government in the Church, to leave private persons or particular congregations to take up what kind of divine service they please. For we hold it requisite that there should be throughout the whole realm a conformity to the order which the laws enjoin."<sup>5</sup> When, soon after their arrival at Massachusetts Bay, in 1630, the Nonconformists of the Established Church entered upon fellowship with the colony of Separatists at Plymouth, they jettisoned all traces of Episcopacy—the Book of Common Prayer, the clerical robe, episcopal ordination. Then the ground seemed cleared for freedom of conscience and the baneful mixture of Church and State, through which the Puritan colony of Massachusetts became a virtual hierocracy. But toleration was no part of the Puritan program. The same intolerance which Archbishop Laud brought to bear upon Puritans in England, they, with the same ruthless relentlessness, inflicted upon their fellow-Christians of a different persuasion—Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians. Although, as far as Church of England people and Presbyterians were concerned, there was no difference in doctrine between themselves and the Puritans in regard to Baptism and the Holy Supper, there was no baptizing of the children of the latter; no admission of them to Holy Communion; no granting of the franchise, save in the narrow sphere of local, or town, government; no permission to plant churches in which they might be served by pastors of their own selection. On the contrary, as in England, dis-

5 Resolution of the Long Parliament of 1641.

senters were compelled to attend worship in the established churches, and then frequently banished or imprisoned for the expression of convictions derogatory to the authorized church establishment. Measures enacted by the General Court of Massachusetts were submitted for approval to the synod of the Puritan clergy, who did not fail to seek and to find Scriptural warrant for practically any measure of intolerance enacted by the Puritan legislature. When the Rev. Mr. Cotton was reproved by Sir Richard Saltonstall for the intolerance in vogue in the colony, he made the characteristic reply: "You think to compel all men in matter of worship is to make men sin (according to Romans 14, 23). If the worship be lawful in itself, the magistrate compelling him to come to it compelleth him not to sin, but the sin is in his will that needs to be compelled to a Christian duty. Josiah compelled all Israel, or (which is all one) made them to serve the Lord their God, yet his act herein was not blamed but recorded among his virtuous actions."<sup>6</sup>

Thank God that, according to a law of nature, from which human nature is not exempt, action is followed by reaction. It was Roger Williams, whose principles made him an exile from Puritan Massachusetts, who championed broad and true views of toleration. Just as a captain, he said, could consistently and successfully manage a ship with a crew of Christians, Turks, Jews, and Pagans, as long as they obeyed his commands, though only Christians might take part in the worship authorized by him, even so dissenters should be tolerated by the State, and be subject to punishment, not for any views held by them, but only for actual infractions of the laws.<sup>7</sup> It was this reaction from Puritanism that resulted in the organization of Rhode Island as a colony, which, with Connecticut, became a beacon to the framers of our American Constitution. While, as Americans, we view Roger Williams as the champion of correct Evangelical views concerning the relations of Church and State, he is

<sup>6</sup> Hutchinson's Collections of Original Papers (1769).

<sup>7</sup> Arnold's History of R. I.



not the first, nor the most noteworthy, advocate of a free Church in a free State. That is Luther. Here is his classic deliverance:

“To the end of the world, the two governments (of the Church and the State) shall remain free from fusion, unlike the Jewish people in the Old Testament. They must remain separate if the right Gospel and faith are to be preserved. The Kingdom of Christ is something vastly separate from the government of the world, which is entrusted to princes and lords. Let the preacher beware of dabbling in the government of the world, lest he should cause confusion and disorder. We are to govern the Church with the Word, or the oral sword, and wield the rod of the mouth. The temporal authorities, on the other hand, have another sword, wielded by the fist, an instrument of discipline for the body. Let the distinction between these two swords or rods be maintained, lest the one interfere in the functions of the other. For they all take to the sword, Anabaptists, Muenzer, the Pope, and the bishops, desiring prerogatives and powers separate from their office: back of all that is the devil. On the other hand, the temporal authorities, the princes, the kings, the rural nobility, even the village squires, wield the oral sword, presuming to dictate to the pastors what and how they should teach and how to manage their churches.”<sup>8</sup>

So Luther, a century before Roger Williams. Thank God that the Lutheran Church, prostrate beneath the heels of the State government as she has often lain, and still lies in the very homelands of the Reformation, has never produced a Calvin or a Cotton to banish the Roger Williamses and to silence at the stake the Servetuses, that have disputed the righteousness of her doctrines and the rightfulness of her sway. That clause in our American Constitution which forbids the establishment of a religion by the Federal Government, was dictated by the voice of Martin Luther, heard in the mistakes and crimes of the Puritan hierarchy of New England.

8 Walch XXI, 356.

Hierarchy, as a principle of temporal government, meant not only intolerance but persecution. Scourging, imprisonment, banishment, exhibition of heretics in the pillory, the cramping of their bodies in the stocks, branding the letter upon the right hand in attestation of the heresy upheld by it,—these were penalties meted out by the victims of prelatical persecution to victims of their own in Massachusetts. Then, with the advent of a second generation, which had lost the poetry of Puritanism and was fast losing its power, keeping only its austerity and gloom, Puritanism steeped its hands in blood. As we read the history of the Quaker and witch trials, especially that of one Winlock Christison, we cannot banish the thought of *Caiaphas redivivus* as judge on the bench.

“What have you to say for yourself why you should not die?” was the question of the governor.

“I have done nothing worthy of death; if I had, I refuse not to die,” came the answer.

“Thou art come in among us in rebellion, which is the sin of witchcraft, and ought to be punished.”

“I came not in among you in rebellion, but in obedience to the God of heaven; not in contempt to any of you, but in love to your souls and bodies; and that you shall know one day, when you and all men must give an account of your deeds done in the body. Take heed; for you cannot escape the righteous judgment of God.” . . . .

“We have a law, and by our law you are to die.”

“So said the Jews of Christ, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die. Who empowered you to make that law?”

“There is a law against Jesuits.”

“If you put me to death it is not because I go under the name of a Jesuit, but a Quaker; therefore I do appeal to the laws of my own nation.” . . . .

“You are in our hands, and have broken our laws, and we will try you.” So the judge.

The jury then went out, and brought in a verdict of guilty, whereupon Governor Endicott pronounced sentence upon the Quaker in the face of dissent from several



magistrates unable to withstand the appeal of innocence.

"I thank God, I am not afraid to give judgment," the judge then proceeded. "Wenlock Christison, hearken to your sentence: You must return to the place from whence you came, and from thence to the place of execution, and there you must be hanged until you be dead, dead, dead."

"The will of the Lord be done, in whose will I came in amongst you, and in his counsel I stand, feeling his eternal power, that will uphold me to the last gasp, I do not question it. Known be it to you all, that if you have the power to take my life from me, my soul shall enter into everlasting rest and peace with God, where you yourselves shall never come." With these words the victim of Puritan fanaticism stepped forth into the shadow of the gibbet. Surely, it is not hard to decide where Christ was represented—at the Puritan bar or on the Puritan bench.<sup>9</sup>

And this disposition to confound the functions of Church and State, this turning of the State government into a virtual hierocracy, this spirit of persecution worthy a Loyola or a Torquemada—beneath the ray of the divine Word it grew its fangs! The Puritan was a reader of the Bible, and his conscience was bound by the conclusions drawn from it. But how were such conclusions possible in view of such teachings? The Old Testament rather than the New was the text-book of the Puritan. Then, there was a fatal misplacement of emphasis. The private right of the interpretation of Scripture was so over-emphasized that the wealth of true doctrine accumulated by the apostolic, the sub-apostolic, the German Evangelical Church, was simply discarded, as if the voice of the Holy Spirit through the ages could safely be ignored. Private judgment was emphasized at the expense of objective truth. No Puritan doubted that his views concerning any subject investigated by him were the mind of the Spirit. How different Father Luther! He inculcated the principle that the primary purpose of the

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Besse's "Collection of the Sufferings of the People Called Quakers" (1753).

Bible is the revelation of the plan of salvation, that directions as to discipline and ritual are given merely in broadest outline, so that to him, ritual and discipline are normally an historic growth under the influence of the Christian conscience and judgment as constantly reinforced by Scripture. And always Luther was keen to preserve whatever blessing of truth the past had possessed. The Puritans, however, although they found little fault with *the doctrines* of the Church of England, desired to abolish everything in the discipline and ritual that lacked Scriptural precedent. Organs are not mentioned in the Bible, hence the organ had to go. Stained glass windows, Gothic arches, clerical robes were put in the ban together with Episcopal ordination. There being no precedent for the church hymn, even that was discarded, and a metric form of the Book of Psalms, in places mere doggerel, became the basis of Puritan hymnody,—a deplorable, albeit characteristic, anachronism because of the preponderance of law in it and the dearth of Gospel music and Pentecostal fulfilment. When a Baptist divine rejected even the use of the vernacular version of the Bible, the *reductio ad absurdum* of fanaticism and individualism was reached.

Of course, in the absence of commonly recognized standards, there could be no agreement, and thus Puritanism became the prolific mother of English and American sects. Small congregations, even those in exile in Holland, would divide and subdivide over questions of mere ritual and discipline; and since religion took rank as a portion of civil service, all views not sanctioned by the element in control of political power, meant political disability and, often, judicial prosecution and penalty.

We have spoken of Calvin as the father of Puritan political thought. He is responsible for another bequest to his offspring; namely, a religious gloom that not only failed to hear the music of Christmas tidings, that not only missed the fragrance of the open grave and the heartening cheer of Pentecost, but actually penalized them when found. Lutheranism gives expression to its



conception of divine sovereignty by representing God's omnipotent power as directed by love, seeking the salvation and securing the redemption of all, and lamenting, in the tears of the incarnate Son, the unwillingness for salvation of the self-excluded. Puritanism, on the other hand, expresses its conception of divine sovereignty by emphasizing God's wrath so as virtually to obscure and deny His love. Calvin's dogma of absolute election became the harp from which the Puritan divine drew his crashing discords. Characteristic of the atmosphere of gloom wherever Puritan theology clouded faith, is Wigglesworth's poem "The Day of Doom," which may serve as a criterion of both Puritan theology and Puritan literary taste after the classically trained first generation of Puritans had been supplanted. Here are a few fragments of the poem in question. The reprobate infants that have passed from the womb to the tomb, and from the tomb to their doom, are represented in Wigglesworth's poem as, for people of such extreme youthfulness, very logically remonstrating with God for hurling them to hell, pleading that they are not responsible for Adam's fall, and themselves have committed no sin yet. After the Lord has told them that they would not have spurned eternal life as the reward of Adam's obedience, and hence, have no right to object to the doom from which sovereign grace has refused to exempt them by the elective decree, their fate is settled in these words, prophetic of the hop-skip-and jump rhythm of Yankee Doodle:

"You sinners are, and such a share  
As sinners may expect,  
Such you shall have; for I do save none but my  
own elect.

Yet to compare your sin with their (sic!)  
Who lived much longer time,  
I do confess yours is much less  
Though every sin's a crime."

“A crime it is ; therefore in bliss  
You may not hope to dwell ;  
But unto you I shall allow  
The easiest room in hell.”  
The glorious king thus answering,  
They cease and plead no longer ;  
Their consciences must needs confess  
His reasons are the stronger.

Proceeding to the lot of the adult victims of divine preterition, the glee felt over their fate would be quite appropriate were it attributed to devils instead of to the Lord and His Saints. May the words speak for themselves :

“They wring their hands, their caitiff hands,  
And gnash their teeth for terror ;  
They cry, they roar, for anguish sore,  
And gnaw their tongues for horror.  
But get away without delay,  
Christ pities not your cry :  
Depart for hell, where you may yell,  
And roar eternally.

“Die fain they would if die they could,  
But death will not be had.  
God’s direful wrath their bodies hath  
For ev’r immortal made.  
They live to die in misery,  
And bear eternal woe ;  
And live they must ; for God is just,  
That He may plague them so.”<sup>11</sup>

At the end of the poem, like roses amid snake-infested cactus, we come upon the words : “*Omnia praetereunt*,

11 Wigglesworth, “The Day of Doom.” We have not hesitated to quote Wigglesworth as representative of Puritanism. Moses Coit Tyler, in his “History of American Literature,” speaks of him as “a poet who so perfectly uttered in verse the religious faith and emotion of the Puritan of New England, that, for more than a hundred years, his writings had universal diffusion there.”



praeter amare deum,"— "all things pass save love for the Lord," a sentiment in which we will join the stern Puritan, but not on the platform of which we just have had a few significant planks. *Our* sympathy is with the infants.

And this Puritan Wigglesworth is the contemporary of our own Paul Gerhardt; and this monstrosity of Puritan hymnody is the contemporaneous Puritan counterpart of our Lutheran "Now thank we all our God," "Wake, arise, the voice is calling," "Commit thy ways confiding." It is readily seen who bore to America the treasures of the Reformation in their fullness, Puritan or Palatine.

Now the Twentieth Century has moved far in its orbit. America is launching out upon uncharted seas. The god of gold and the god of power, strangers to Puritan and Palatine, are laying siege to the nation's heart. Whose faith, if followed by America, will save from disaster, that of the descendants of the Puritans or that of the sons of the Palatines? The Puritan has given his blood to many of those who represent to-day the wealth and the political power of the nation. The Palatine, probably more numerous if we use that term as representative of the tens of thousands of Lutheran Germans who peopled Pennsylvania to the time of the Revolutionary War, have infused their blood into a people even more numerous, though they belong to the American yeomanry rather than to the aristocracy. The historian, the poet, and the romancer have represented the Puritan as the main contributor to all that makes for strength and moral worth in the nation. The Palatine and the Salzburger, on the other hand, have received scant recognition. "What good can come out of Nazareth?" The Palatine has spread over the Empire and the Keystone States, strengthening the yeomanry of that region, and giving it wholesome blood no less loyal because it came from the Rhine instead of from the Severn and the Dee. From their original habitat, the Palatines, our original Pennsylvania Germans, have swarmed down into the valleys of the Appalachians, and have joined hands with the off-

spring of the Salzburger in the South. Far to the West they have moved, and mingled with those of later arrival, the Germans, the Danes, the Swedes, and the Norwegians, all heirs to the same heritage of faith. While the Palatines may have largely forgotten their native speech, they have remembered their native faith.

What relation does the Palatine bear to the nation? Shall, at the third centennial of the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers, in 1920, the Palatine be accounted as a mere graft upon the Puritan stock, destined to lose his identity by his social and political fusion with it? No, the Lutheran Palatine has been a nation builder as well, if not as conspicuously, as the Puritan. It was he who, during the French and Indian War, held the passes of the Appalachian Mountains in Pennsylvania against the savage, protecting with loyalty and valor the flank of the English and Colonial armies. With the descendant of the Puritan he suffered at Valley Forge and conquered at Yorktown, and there is no Southern battlefield on which Lutheran blood has not been shed. Kipling sings of the right of the English to the sea:

“We have fed our sea for a thousand years  
And she calls us, still unfed,  
Though there’s never a wave of all her waves  
But marks our English dead:  
We have strawed our best to the weed’s unrest,  
To the shark and the sheering gull,  
If blood be the price of admiralty,  
Lord God, we have paid it in full.”

And if blood be the price of citizenship, and the contribution of industrious, loyal, healthy stock its best exercise, then that price has been paid, and that contribution has been made by us Lutherans of America. The Lutheran is not a newcomer to the hospitality of the Stars and Stripes: with the Puritans of New England, with the Huguenots of the Carolinas, with the cavaliers of Virginia, with the Scotch-Irish of the Shenandoah Valley, the Lutherans of the South and the Middle States unfurled the nation’s flag in the battle thunder in which it was



born; and the red of its stripes is in part the blood of Lutherans who have helped to found, and have ever continued to build, America.

But the opportunities of service our country has given us in the past pale into insignificance with that required in the present. Puritanism, much lauded as the most potent moral and spiritual influence in our history, has largely spent its spiritual force, losing its Evangelical faith, whereas the faith of the descendants of the Palatine is the same true, heroic, world-conquering faith that quickened the Weisers and the Muhlenbergs for service patriotic and divine, and sustained the fathers in their servitude in the pine forests of the Hudson. All is not well with the spiritual life of the nation. Material science dominates the issues of the day. Life, in the secular schools of learning, is represented as a play of material and mechanical forces; it has largely ceased to be a quest of the spiritual. There is much superficial information, relating to the constituents and forces of matter, but where steam and electricity and chemistry are made to perform the miracles of science, men are often strangers to the miracle and mystery of regeneration. Where men are cock-sure of evolution as the key to the riddle of the universe, they are emptiest of inner certainty. With a materialistic science and the idolatry of gold and pleasure fitting minds and souls, there is need to ask whether the heritage of the Reformation, which is the very blossom of time and the promise of eternity, is not imperiled in America.

Can Puritanism, as at present we find it, save the day? Also we Lutherans acknowledge the worth of the *old* Puritans and own our indebtedness to them. The godliness and courage and devotion to principle, exhibited by the first emigrants to New England, the Pilgrim Fathers, with Bradford and Brewster at their head, can hardly be overestimated, whatever we may think of the later hunters of Quakers and witches in Massachusetts and their poetry. But not even a Bradford and a Brewster lived closer to God than the Saints of Salzburg that served God

in the forests along the Savannah. The language which the Puritans and Cavaliers gave to America we have adopted as our own, to give to our country through it the wealth of Reformation truth. Our congregational democracy we have gotten from the Puritans, and we know a good thing when we see it. With the descendant of the Puritans we stand committed to the best conventions of American life; and with him we will stand shoulder to shoulder in smiting that social curse, the saloon. Whereas, in the exercise of Lutheran sobriety, we will not impeach the beneficent guest at the wedding of Cana by denouncing wine as a creature of the devil, we will abstain from it, to strengthen the cause of temperance. We honor the Puritans of Massachusetts for founding the public school system of America, which, under God, has become the highest factor in welding into homogeneity the diverse racial elements that have followed in the wake of Bradford and Winthrop. Thanking the Puritan for having taught by his abhorrent example that intolerance of dissenters is a sin, we should let him teach us intolerance of error, too, had not better teachers—our own peerless Luther, our Chemnitzes and Gerhards and a hundred others, above all, the history of our Church—taught us that when Lutheranism becomes tolerant of error as such, it spurns its own distinctive ideals and surrenders much of its power. Whatever is good in Puritanism, we Lutherans possess to an even higher degree in our own history and Confessions; what is evil in it has eventuated in the utter inability of the Puritans of to-day to meet the spiritual needs of America. For one thing we dare affirm without hesitation: While the Puritan of the Seventeenth Century has brought across the waters the faith of the Reformation in a perverted Calvinistic form, his descendant of to-day is about to jettison it altogether. Our Washington Gladdens and our Lyman Abbotts prove that the Puritans of to-day have ceased to recognize in the Bible the inerrant Voice. The descendants of the old Separatists are largely a unit in their repudiation of Scripture as the Word of God and of the cardinal doc-



trines of the Gospel—the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, Justification by Faith alone, and the authority of Scripture. Enthusiastic interest in the purification of politics, in the quickening of the social conscience, are there; but, with faith in the divine Word, with allegiance to the divine-human Christ gone, all these are dead works,

“the lifeless beauty of the dead,

Laid out in state and decorated with the silent pomp of death.”

The outliving by Puritanism of its erstwhile Evangelical faith—that is the challenge to the descendant or spiritual congener of Salzburger and Palatine, who still is living his. Christ has not changed; and that the Lutheran of to-day, doing business behind his desk or counter, or drawing furrows athwart the hillside, or bending over her babe in the cradle, has grown in the appreciation of the historic, storm-tried faith of the Reformation, is proof that the Lutheran Church has the power to rise to the occasion. The eternal verities of Lutheranism are Columbia's need and Columbia's hope. May the Lutherans of America, in steady percolations of power, in unceasing radiations of light, in fruitful harvests of spiritual life, in far-shining flashes of Pentecostal fire, supply that need and fulfill that hope,—no less true to the Stars and Stripes because, for our highest inspiration to faith and duty, we hearken, not to Plymouth, nor to Salem, still less to Geneva, but to Wittenberg.

*Columbus, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FORCES OF GERMANY.

BY WILLIAM CLINTON HEFFNER, A.M., PH.D. (U. OF PA.)

The social unit of the Germanic race was the *March Genossenschaft*—Mark Organization—or primitive village community. Practically speaking it was a little republic, but actually it was not, because it was overlaid by a territorial domination imposed, either by direct conquest, or else accepted voluntarily for the protection indispensable in that rude age. In this territorial domination we find the kernel that governed all German society, *the relation which every individual, whether high or low, rich or poor, sustained to land*. The slogan of mediaeval polity was, “no land without a lord”; which the bourgeois, or commercial class opposed with, “money has, or knows no master.” The conflict between the two is the source of the social history of the Middle Ages.

At the bottom of the social pyramid was the peasant grouped under three divisions according to the relation he sustained to the lord’s territorial domain of which he was an integral part. Next came the knighthood, or knightly class, the inferior nobility and the *Ehrbarkeit* of the less important towns. The last two held their land direct from the lord while the former constituted a military caste in the service of the lord. Above this were the free towns and cities that held directly from the emperor. They were governed by three councils: the Upper, composed chiefly of the *Ehrbarkeit*; the Common, composed of the masters of the different guilds and the General, composed of the free citizens. Then came the nobles and princes who ruled the princely domains granted them, either by the emperor, or the head of the Church. The apex of the pyramid was contended for by the empe-



ror of the "Holy Roman Empire" and the Prince of Christendom.

The organization of this social pyramid at the time of the Reformation was feudal throughout but had run to seed. Abundant evidences of far-reaching changes existed everywhere. The mind of the age had outgrown the old doctrines at least in spirit, if not, in form and content. While theology still reigned supreme in the world of research and scholarship, this supremacy was disputed by classical literature and natural philosophy. The idea of *salvation by the faith of the individual* was latent in the minds of many as well as its corollary, *to attain salvation, membership in a specific form of church organization is not a necessity*; both were waiting for a master mind to give them form and content. While government was becoming more centralized Roman civil law was displacing the tribal customary laws. The new theories of nature systematized and reduced to form and rule the old superstitions, but through them the new physical sciences based on observation and experiment were peeping. Alchemy and astrology were the physical sciences in which Copernicus and Tycho Brahe were born and educated but which were no longer able to satisfy the expanding mind. The quest for the means of transmuting the baser metals into gold; for the elixir vitae that would cure all diseases and restore man to perennial youth and the philosopher's stone which contained not only the first two but also the quintessence of all metals and the planetary influences to which the metals correspond together with the control of all the forces and destinies of man, were waning before modern discovery and travel. The extended use of fire arms; the rapid increase of printing and the spread of the new learning by the itinerant Greek teachers; the increased travel and discovery of new lands in the hitherto unknown parts of the world; the sweeping economic and commercial changes that resulted in the rise of capitalism, commercial syndicates and city trading confederations known as "Hansas" or "Hanseatic Leagues"; the development of the powerful craft and



trade guilds—all of which summed up under the title of *The Advancing Tide of Social Progress*—indicated the early downfall of the old mediaeval civilization with its decayed knights, lavish princes and capitalists, turbulent townsmen, bold defiant rebellious peasants, assertive and aggressive craft and trade guildsmen, licentious monks and friars and mendicant scholars. A leader of daring and unflinching courage, gigantic intellect, commanding personality and indomitable will was awaited.

A somewhat detailed study of the conditions of the different classes that constituted German society is necessary in order to grasp the real significance and meaning of the great upheaval. At the bottom of the pyramid, as we said, were the peasants. They were the most numerous group, and were divided into three sub-classes. First, there was the *Leibeigner* or serf who was practically a slave—the bearer of unlimited burdens and the cultivator of his lord's domain. Whenever a change of ownership occurred he passed with the land to the new owner. Second, there was the *Höriger* or villein whose services were limited to a few days of each week or a certain portion of each year. And last, came the *Frier* or free peasant who discharged his obligation to the lord by the payment of a quit rent either in kind or money for his holdings.

The peasant's characteristic garb was a coat and a hat of brown and the high laced shoe—the "*Bundschuh*"—which was emblazoned on the banners used in the uprisings. They were not down-trodden and half starved as is so frequently claimed, but proud, robust and bold and ever ready to take up arms in defense of the advantages and privileges won with the deprivation of which they were continually menaced by the numerous forged church and state documents. Not only were they bold and defiant but also quite well-to-do and enjoying considerable luxuries. Wimpeling writes, "The peasants in our district and in many parts of Germany have become through their riches stiff-necked and ease loving. I know peasants who at the weddings of their sons and daughters, or at the baptisms of their children make so much display



that a house and field might be bought therewith and a small vineyard to boot. Through their riches they are oftentimes spendthrifts in food and vestments and they drink wines of price." In 1478 an Austrian chronicler writes, "They wear better garments and drink better wines than the lords." Heinrich Müller of Suabia in 1550, nearly two generations later, writes thus, "In the memory of my father who was a peasant man, the peasant did eat much better than now. Meat and food was there every day and at fairs and other junketings the tables did wellnigh break with what they bore. Then drank they wine as it were water; then did a man fill his belly and carry away withal as much as he could; then was wealth and plenty; otherwise is it now. A costly and bad time has arisen since many a year, and the food and drink of the best peasant is much worse than of yore—that of the day laborer and the serving man."

Wages were usually reckoned in what they would buy. In 1525 a day laborer received nine groschen and keep, or sixteen groschen without keep. In Suabia he received eighteen pfennig. Beyruth paid the same. In Augsburg a day's wages equalled six pounds of the best meat, or one pound of meat, seven eggs, a peck of peas, bread as needed with enough left over for lodging, clothing and minor expenses. At Aix-la-Chapelle a week's wages would buy a lamb, seven sheep and eight pigs. A day's earnings would purchase two geese. In Klosters-Auberg from 1485 to 1509 the wages of a day laborer were ten farthings and his board. A pair of shoes could then be purchased for three groschen, a sheep for four groschen while a hen cost a half a groschen, and firewood by the load, five groschen. Rye cost from six to seven groschen per bushel. When board constituted a part of the wages of a laborer, stringent rules governed the furnishing thereof. A Bavarian regulation prescribes the following: breakfast, soup and vegetables; dinner, soup and vegetables, a bowl of broth, or a plate of salted or pickled meat; supper, soup and meat, carrots and preserved meat. In Saxony two meals had to consist of four courses each.

On feast days they received roasted meat and were allowed to take with them in addition, "a great loaf of bread and so much of flesh as two at one meal may eat." In order to check the excessive eating and drinking and the development of expensive habits, rigid sumptuary laws were enacted in some of the states of the empire of which those of the Reichstag of Lidau may be a sufficient citation. No one, "shall neither make nor wear cloth that costs more than half a gulden the ell; neither shall they wear gold, pearls, velvet, silk, nor embroidered clothes, nor shall they permit their wives and children to wear such."

These citations prove that the peasants as a class were prosperous, well-fed and clothed and enjoyed considerable luxuries. The purchasing value of their day's labor exceeded considerably that of our own day. Many of them enjoyed also the facilities of the church schools and possessed a fair education. A peasantry down-trodden and reduced to the lowest level is devoid of a spirit that is ready to defend its acquired rights and privileges. The execution of a reform requires a peasantry that is prosperous, bold, defiant and tenacious of its acquisitions and ready to defend them. That the peasantry of Luther's day was not that of the day of Huss is proven by its action when the squeezing process began.

Every society possessing the elements of endurance must have its solid substantial middle class. Knighthood was the stabilizer of mediaeval society and constituted its middle class. It furnished the body of armed retainers for the lords and princes, the elements out of which they constructed their standing armies. A knight's occupation was war, the tournament and society. Entrance to the order required a long period of training attended with considerable expense, conditions which prevented many from acquiring membership. In the order was embodied the highest ideals of manhood, honor and chivalry. As retainers they followed their lord whenever and wherever he engaged in warfare. As a class they despised and hated intensely the citizens of the free cities, the artisans



and the rich bourgeois because they had no territorial family name and engaged in pursuits devoid of honor. So long as every lord possessed the right of private warfare, neither life, nor property in Germany was safe. Guerilla warfare was the normal condition of the country. In 1495 the right of waging private warfare was suppressed and henceforth only the major lords dared defy the edict. Thousands of knights were deprived of their occupation. Unwilling to engage in any other they inaugurated a period of wholesale robbery and plunder, justifying it on the ground that it was necessary for the maintenance of their social position. Towns and peasants rose in rebellion to curb their lawlessness and restore order. Conflicts occurred continually and Germany was in a state of chaos and anarchy.

Gunpowder was the best civilizer of Germany as well as the special high constable that the emergency demanded. With the organization of the *landsknechte*—mercenary soldiers—into battalions of infantry and artillery equipped with the latest types of rifle and cannon knightly warfare waged as a chivalric pastime and for plunder soon lost its attractiveness. When panoplied armor and castle walls crumbled and lost their protective power before rifle bullets and cannon balls knighthood rapidly disintegrated. The last flower of the Grand Knights of Germany was Franz von Sickingen who with Ulric von Hutten were the firebrands in the side of Luther. Von Sickingen was convinced in his own mind that knighthood had a future and offered his services together with those of his knightly retainers to Luther in the interest of the Reformation. It was he who stood off from Worms with his knights in martial array when Luther was before the Diet ready to storm it if necessary. Some historians claim and with some plausibility too, that his menacing attitude deterred Charles V from surrendering Luther to be burned as a heretic. After the Diet had adjourned and Luther was safe in the Wartburg the strong leash was removed and von Sickingen resolved to try conclusions with the Archbishop of Treves who refused to

repay five thousand Rhenish gilders which had been paid him for ransoming a prisoner. The artillery fire of the archbishop's legions quickly destroyed the *landstuhl*, von Sickingen's famous castle, in the ruins of which von Sickingen died in the hands of his captors. His death was not the tragic death of a hero, nor the destruction of a party or faction but the end of an epoch, of a state of society, because henceforth knighthood as a force or factor in the polity and the society of Europe was known no more. With its passing there passed also the stable middle class of mediaeval society.

The upper social strata included the princes, lay and clerical, and the free cities or towns. The former held their lands direct, either from the emperor, or the Church and were their immediate supports. All of them enjoyed semi-independent executive, legislative and judicial powers. In many things their decisions were ultimate. Practically all of them wielded despotic powers in emergencies, if not regularly. All were plotting most of the time and some all the time to throw off the powers of emperor and pope and attain the coveted position of independent sovereign princes.

The free cities were little republics under a burgomaster and the *Ehrbarkeit* which with the patricians met in the *Rath*. They sprung up around the lord's castle and the industrial and trading centers. As a general rule they controlled also the peasantry in the immediate adjoining country.

The emperor who was the capstone of the pyramid was an elective personality. The Electoral College was composed of three archbishops, three electoral princes and a minor king. Its most memorable historical action was the election of Charles V in 1519 as emperor of the well-nigh defunct "Holy Roman Empire."

No society or government can endure which is minus a strong, stable and vigorous middle class. In mediaevalism knighthood occupied this place. With its fall society and government was left seemingly without its necessary adjunct. All social classes develop gradually and conse-



quently for decades a new class was preparing to assume knighthood's function as a stabilizer when it passed with the death of von Sickingen. This new force was the rapidly growing artisan and trading group which ultimately became the wedge that split North Germany from the papal power.

The opening up of the Orient was the initial move in the expansion of the mind of Europe to a world view of men and things. In the wake of the crusader followed the enterprising trader. While the crusaders were conquering Palestine for the Church they were conquering eastern trade, developing trade routes and founding commercial cities on the Mediterranean littorals and in the interior of the continent for the distribution of the products of the Oriental World. The daring and energetic men of North Europe established the Hansas on the Baltic and North Seas and sent their vessels to Portugal and Spain and via the Strait of Gibraltar and the Mediterranean Sea to the commercial ports of Western Asia to bring back Asiatic and South Sea commodities. These activities produced three new social and economic forces, commercial capitalism, commercial syndicates and trade guilds; the progenitors of our modern trusts, combinations and industrial organizations. The most famous of them were the Hanseatic League and the East and West India Companies of the countries of Western Europe.

A fundamental tenet of commerce is that in the process of exchange in the long run one commodity must pay for another. To balance the trade with the Orient commercial capitalism had to procure a medium of exchange, either direct or circuitous. The solution to this problem was the organization of Germany industrially. This led to the development of industrial capitalism and craft guilds. The members of these groups combined with those in transportation and exchange produced the new stable middle class which occupies the position in modern civilization that knighthood did in mediaeval. It is

founded upon the motto, "Money has and knows no master."

At the bottom of Sixteenth Century commerce and industry was the guild. The two main divisions were trade and craft. The latter had a subdivision under the name of the "Journeyman Guilds." The "Beggars' Guild" was really an adjunct to all of the others. To it belonged not only those who followed that vocation but also the migratory university students and teachers. It performed all those functions which are now performed by the telephone, telegraph, cable and press.

Everyone engaged in trade and industrial enterprises owed first allegiance to his guild. Outside of guild organization no one was allowed to engage in or conduct any business. While they were the progenitors of our modern labor and selling organizations yet in their operation they were far more powerful, imperialistic, exclusive and tyrannical. Hostility among journeymen, craft and trade guilds was as keen and irreconcilable as is that to-day between labor and capital. All rights belonged to the guild and to the individual only as a member of the guild. The unalterable and inexorable law was, no labor nor trade rights outside of guild organization.

In a guild there were no contractors nor supernumeraries. Each had its master appointed by the town organization who worked with the apprentices and the journeymen. All raw material was purchased by the guild organization and distributed among the masters. Secret processes and advantages belonged not to any individual but to the guild as a body. Each guild had its guild house where all its solemn functions and social gatherings were held. Each had its ecclesiastical stamp and patron saint. The qualifications for membership specified that an applicant must be honest with a reputation vouched for by good authority, or by document, pious and born of pious parents in lawful wedlock. Idleness, staying out late at night, drinking and debauchery were strictly forbidden. Anyone guilty of dishonor was expelled. The organizations were also mutual aid societies for securing employ-



ment for members, caring for the sick, the impoverished, the widows and the orphans and the establishing of hospitals. Hours of labor and wages were regulated on the principle of equity and fraternity; also the number of apprentices and journeymen. No one was allowed to work them at night nor on Sundays and holy days. Severe penalties were inflicted on those masters who violated guild enactments.

All work was required to be of standard grade. What was below was destroyed. Augsburg not only provided for six different grades of bread but also that they had to be baked in different ovens. There were inspectors of bread, flour, flesh, fish, wine and beer. Laws against adulteration were severer than any other. Sellers of bad provisions or underweight were punished either by fines, expulsion, or loss of trade rights. For instance, a baker who falsified the composition of his bread was shut up in a basket fastened to a long pole and let down to the bottom of a pool of dirty water. In 1546 two grocers and a female assistant were burned alive at Nurnberg for adulterating saffron and other spices. In 1492 a similar offense was punished in a similar way at Augsburg.

Strikes were not uncommon. They were usually waged between the guilds and the municipalities. The most famous were the bakers' strike at Colmar in Alsace which lasted ten years and that between the masters and the companions at Nurnberg in 1475.

Wages in the craft guilds were proportionately of the same high character as those of the peasants. In many instances they represented even a larger purchasing power. In South Germany masons and carpenters received sixteen to twenty denarii and maintenance. Beef was then selling at two denarii a pound. In Saxony they received two groschen and four pfennigs a day plus certain gratuities as to maintenance and comforts. Consequently the ease of their life as well as their wealth far exceeded that of the peasants. When strikes occurred they were against town or guild regulations not for higher wages.

Trade guilds differed materially from craft guilds in organization and purpose. While they likewise had moral and religious communal rights their life was monastic instead of domestic. Their object was to secure privileges and advantages and develop trade monopolies. They were known as "Hansas" and had recognition privileges at home and abroad. Their center was the guild hall where an alderman and the members of the council drew up the constitution. It usually stood in the center of the enclosure, the whole being known as *der stahlhof*,—steelyard. The United Hansa had an extensive and powerful jurisdiction over local Hansas and enforced the most stringent regulations. The local Hansa at Bergen, Norway, for instance, had twenty-one units of fifteen families each of masters, journeymen and apprentices. Over each family was a "*Husband*" who discharged his duties by the exercise of despotic powers. To become a member an apprentice had to live in Bergen ten years after which he was initiated by ducking in icy waters, receiving severe flagellations and performing menial services. Women were not eligible and no woman was ever allowed to cross the threshold. No one could become a foreman, master, or alderman except by passing through all the grades. All of the Hansas were rich and influential and frequently formed amalgamations for enhancing their wealth and influence as did Lynn, Boston, York, Bristol, Ipswich, Norwich, Yarmouth, and Hull with London.

The members of the trade guilds were much richer than the peasants, or the members of the craft guilds and became objects of envy and hatred to prince and prelate. Repressive laws were enacted by Church and State to prevent further amalgamations and combinations of capital and capital goods by the wealthy bourgeois and Hansas. As an example of this permit us to cite a decision by the Reichstag at Nurnberg in 1522-1523, sitting as a court of justice. The decision embraced three points. First, are monopolies hurtful to the Holy Empire and, therefore, to be destroyed? Second, are all companies



and combinations bad? Third, by what means shall the bad be eliminated? The decision of the court affirmed the following: First, monopolies are hurtful because they carry out of the country wares needed, especially gold and silver, and lessen trading and consuming. Second, those dealing with foreigners suck out German life and should be destroyed; others should be regulated moderately. Third, the following regulations were set forth for the exempted class: capital of any business be restricted to from 20,000 to 50,000 gulden: sworn statements required: stock not to be enhanced by gain: gain must be divided every two years and the State notified: no money to be loaned with usury: no sort or class of ware to be brought under the control of one man: amalgamation of companies forbidden under penalty of loss of goods: purchases at one time not to exceed 100 cwt. of pepper, 100 cwt. of ginger and of other spices, 50 cwt. and only four purchases allowed to the trade: employment of dummy companies for purchasing forbidden under penalty of return of goods to the seller with restitution of half the price; the other half to go to the State: price maintenance not binding on a buyer who may resell at a lower rate, if he chooses: foreign companies subject to same penalties as domestic: owing to sea dangers Hansas are forbidden to make trading voyages to Spain and Portugal and trade with those countries be interdicted until they are willing to send their ships to Antwerp, Dantzic and other Hansa towns in order to break Lisbon's monopoly of the spice trade: speculators and middlemen forbidden to sell at higher than determined price, violations thereof to be punished by confiscation of goods, one-half to the empire and the other half to the local community.

Trade in Europe at this time was dominated by three great capitalistic houses: The Fuggers of Augsburg in South Germany and the Hochstetters and Welsners in North Germany. The former was the financier of Charles V to whose election it contributed 300,000 ducats and later 170,000 for his Italian Wars. In 1505 the Fug-

gers amalgamated their wealth with that of the Hochstetters and Welsners forming an aggregation greater and more powerful in that day than any of to-day. If the Rothschilds, the Rockefellers and Vanderbilts amalgamated their acquisitions the combination might be considered proportionate to that of Fugger, Hochstetter and Welsner of the Sixteenth Century.

Summarizing the factors of our discussion thus far we find that German society at the dawn of the Reformation consisted of a large body of thrifty peasants, conscious of their power, bold and defiant; a small group of knights whose organization disappeared with the death of von Sickingen; a vigorous body of turbulent townsmen; a multitude of powerful trade and craft guilds entrenched behind a Gibraltar of wealth and position; a group of licentious, indolent and profligate monks and friars; a horde of beggars, mendicant scholars and hireling soldiers; two divisions of noble rank, princes and prelates and an emperor and a pope vying for supremacy. Politically Roman Civil law had displaced tribal customs, and royal and ecclesiastical courts those of the mark. England and France had developed fairly centralized governments. In Germany centralization did not go beyond the prince. Ecclesiastical power centered in the pope. The opening up of the great trade routes to the Orient and the Occident, the development of industry and trade in Europe, the new methods in agriculture, science and art, the amassing of huge fortunes in the distribution of the product of industry, developed a new life, a new mind, a new philosophy of life that was rending asunder the old dry shells and husks of mediaevalism. A new world mind was created for the solution of a new world problem.

These new economic conditions resulted in an enormous increase in prices, a marked advance in human wants, an enlarged consumption and a display of unprecedented ostentation and extravagance. In this the bourgeois greatly exceeded prince and prelate and artisan and peasant the lesser clergy and nobility. It was a common oc-



currence to squander a small fortune at the meeting of a single Reichstag. At the meeting of a Reichstag at Augsburg the Fuggers entertained the Emperor, Charles V at their palatial residence, the Weinmarkt, and in commemoration of the event, burned his overdue acceptances on a large fire of cinnamon, then the most costly of spices. Knight, prince, prelate, emperor, pope, all paled into insignificance before the merchant and industrial princes and prosperous artisans and peasants. The spirit of luxury penetrated every ecclesiastical and princely court while debauchery followed in its wake. In order to keep pace with the display of wealth and the luxurious standard of living set by the middle group, prince, prelate, emperor and pope resolved to apply the squeezing process. Before the rich bourgeois they were helpless but the thrifty and prosperous artisan and peasant offered an alluring and tempting field for operations on a vast scale. Larger and ever larger sums were demanded of them to be paid to the local Church which in turn transmitted them to bishopric and archbishopric and by these to those from whom they held their rights, privileges and prerogatives. To these exactions were added the enormous expenses in the changing of bishoprics and journeys to Rome. By these means mortgaged lands and castles were to be redeemed, political intrigue carried on, effete worn-out mediaeval institutions maintained and ostentation and extravagance rehabilitated irrespective of how severely industrial and commercial Germany would suffer. It was a case of Ajax defying the lightning.

By 1517 all the methods employed, either to check the progress of artisan and peasant, of industry and commerce, or to supply the funds needed by prince and prelate, had failed. A last desperate means of taxation was then resorted to in order to subvert the social and economic progress of North Germany and maintain a decayed and tottering mediaevalism that was falling to pieces by the sheerness of its own weight. The instrument employed was the *indulgence* in its worst form.

The peasant was proud, robust and defiant. The artisan was thrifty, prosperous and well intrenched behind his guild organization. Both were ready to defend what they had acquired and won and were looking for a leader of indomitable will, unflinching courage, magnetic personality and gigantic intellect. In the night of October 31, 1517, this leader emerged quietly from the precincts of his professorial domicile at the University of Wittenberg carrying a hammer, a few nails and a piece of parchment. He wended his way through the streets of the city to the Old Castle Church and nailed on its door the Magna Charta of a new Germany, a new Europe and a new world. The event marked the death of mediaevalism and the birth of the new modern civilization.

Fundamentally the Reformation was a progressive social and economic movement of tremendous proportions, against which the reactionary forces in both Church and State hurled themselves with every manner of unscrupulousness. The new industrial and commercial life, however, had created a new social consciousness which was the wall of adamant that blocked their way and demanded a new reformed church life, spiritually as well as institutionally. It is true, as we shall show in a subsequent discussion, that this social consciousness was revolutionary in character until the suppression of the peasants' rebellion in 1525-1526 with which expired every immediate possibility for social and economic betterment in Central and South Germany. The suppression of the revolt also changed the character of the Reformation. Henceforth it became more distinctly and exclusively a religious revolt. This fact coupled with the fact that the leader came from the ranks of the ecclesiastics is the reason why the ecclesiastical has always overshadowed the social and the economic. If, however, the social and the economic had not created a new North Germany, Luther would have followed the footsteps of Huss.

In 1850 when the great Omnibus Bill was debated in Congress the country was quaking in its very founda-



tions. The great triumvirate of American orators, Clay Calhoun and Webster for days poured forth a flood of oratory that rivalled that of a Demosthenes. When they sank exhausted into their seats a senator arose, greatly their inferior in experience and reputation, who represented the new spirit of the new North. Were it not for two passages in his speech it would have sunk unsung and forgotten into that limbo of congressional speeches, the Congressional Globe Appendix. The two passages expressed the spirit of the new commercial and industrial life of the North and ever since have moulded the history of the country. Turning toward the men who represented an effete and outgrown institution which they strove to maintain at all hazards, he thundered with all the eloquence at his command, "*Gentlemen, there is a higher law,*" than that of princes, potentates and nations before which we must bow. Following this with a few preparatory statements he hurled the second into their midst like a thunderbolt from a clear sky, "*Gentlemen, you cannot roll back the tide of social progress.*"

When pope and emperor, prince and prelate, in the Sixteenth Century attempted to "roll back the tide of social progress," their efforts were crushed by the social and economic Gibraltar of North Germany. The slogan of the Reformation, "The Just shall live by Faith," formulated and given expression by Luther, while embodying a potent theological content and meaning, has underlying it also the slogan of the new North of 1850, formulated and given expression, content and meaning by William H. Seward. "The just shall live by faith," and, "You cannot roll back the tide of social progress," are co-ordinate expressions of the same eternal truth, *human development moves forward, never backward... Progression not regression.*

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

## MINISTERS AS PREACHERS OF THE WORD.

BY REV. J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

God has purposed to save the world by the preaching and teaching of the Word. From the beginning of human experience man's knowledge of God, and his growth in the divine life have come by the preaching and teaching process. But as we propose at this time to consider ministers of the Gospel as teachers of the Word we would not minimize the preaching of the Word as such by giving special emphasis to the teaching of it. But the careful student has observed that in every period of ecclesiastical history the work of God's people has prospered in proportion to the prominence given to the teaching of His Word, or, on the other hand has waned when the Word, with its proper exposition, has been relegated to the vaults. All students of history are familiar with the fact that those periods known as "*The Dark Ages*" are the periods in which *the Bible was an unknown Book*. They were times when the ministry failed to exercise its capacity as a teaching force. And wherever the Word of God has been taught in its purity spiritual darkness has vanished as the darkness before the morning sun, and the power of sin and the pall of unbelief have been dispersed by the presence of God as the darkest clouds before the noonday sun. In short history is continually repeating itself. And from it we learn that the index to the character and progress of every epoch in the history of the past has been in keeping with the manner and extent of the teaching of the Word of God. With the Jews, at the advent of Christ, the instruction was of a perfunctory sort by the Scribes and doctors of the Law, exclusively from the "Law and the Prophets," and hence a church and people with little if any spiritual vitality—a veritable "*Valley of dry bones*" as so graphically described by the prophet



Ezekiel, (37:—). Not indeed because of its instruction from "The Law and the Prophets" as such; nor yet because it was from the lips of the Scribes and Doctors of the Law, but because of the manner of the presentation of the truth. Or better because of the failure to present the vital truths of the Word. By an excessive theorizing and philosophizing about the Law and the prophets the weightier matters were overlooked and ignored, and their teachers became as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals." 1 Cor. 13:1.

Of the world's greatest teacher of men we read (Matt. 7:28, 29) that "The people were astonished at His doctrine; for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes." On different occasions the Evangelists refer to the wonder excited by our Lord's teaching. At Capernaum as He taught in their synagogues "*They were astonished at His doctrine, for His Word was with power.*" Luke 4:32. "Whence hath this man His wisdom?" was the frequent inquiry of His countrymen. Those who were sent to apprehend Jesus excused themselves for not executing the command of their superiors on the ground that "*never man spake like this man.*" John 7:46. But what gave His message such efficacy and power? Or in what respects did His message differ from that of the Scribes? For the difference is certainly very marked. The answer is evident and as clear and marked as were the results in their teaching: Jesus said, "*Thus it is written,*" and "*Thus saith the Lord,*" while the Scribes expatiated largely upon the sayings and opinions of men with their traditions. In short when Jesus spake "it was a message from God, and came with the authority and power of God." It was not simply Jesus speaking as a messenger, but it was in fact "the word." It was God speaking. And what gave efficacy and power to His teaching will, in a measure at least, give efficacy and power to the word of His teachers to-day. For, put Christ into the Word and, in a sense, it is God speaking to His hearers.

The tendency of the recent past has not been so much

toward the letter righteousness of the Jews, nor yet toward the speculative and critical method of the less distant past, as the catering to the more popular hankering after entertainment—a class described by Paul in his letter to Timothy (2 Tim. 3:2-5). While there has been a tendency in some quarters to deal with the speculative, the far stronger tendency has been toward a so-called “Pulpit Eloquence,” and “Pulpit Oratory,” and not infrequently to “Sensationalism.” But this is not the true idea of the ministerial office. And, God be praised, there is reformation in the air. The Church is reverting again to a simpler and purer Gospel. In every department of our church work the key-note of it is “*Teach.*” In our Young People’s Societies, in our Sunday Schools, in our Women’s Societies, in our Brotherhood meetings—everywhere the Word of God is being taught with a directness and pungency of application as never before since the days of the apostles. Even our greatest Evangelists are reverting to a simpler and more direct use of the Gospel in their work with more salutary and lasting results. And hence as ministers of the Gospel we can not be blind to the real functions of our office nor derelict in the performance of our duties, nor slow in taking advantage of our privileges.

The fundamental idea of the office of the Gospel ministry is comprehended in the term “*Teach.*” That is, *imparting instruction in divine things.* When the Master sent forth His disciples, the commission was, “*Go teach all nations, \* \* \* teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*” He himself appeared pre-eminently as a “*Teacher.*” From the beginning to the end of His busy ministry we read that “*He Taught.*” Along the public highway, on the streets of the great cities, in the home, in their synagogues and in the temple. as well as in His famous sermon on the mount we read that “*He taught them.*” And Nicodemus could pay him no greater eulogy than when he said, “*We know that thou art a teacher come from God.*” (John 3:2). When calling some of His disciples He said, “Come, follow me, and



I will make you fishers of men.” How? By “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.” Peter’s pungent and eloquent sermon on the day of Pentecost brought conviction to His hearers because He reasoned with them from the Scriptures. Apollos was an eloquent man, for we read, “*He was mighty in the Scriptures.*” Paul was a strong preacher (called the “chief of the apostles,”) but his strength or power was in his use of the Scriptures. It was when he “reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come” that Felix trembled. Hence as Christ himself was pre-eminently “The Teacher” of the Word; and as He gave special emphasis to the matter of teaching in His commission to His disciples; and as they gave special attention to it in their public work so it should have a prominent place in the office of the ministry now. Therefore *the ministry should be pre-eminently a teaching force.*

But the inquiry may be raised:

1. *What shall be the nature of their teaching?*

Shall it be a mere rational exposition of the letter of word? To this we must answer very emphatically, No! It should be this, but much more: It should be Scriptural to the letter, it is true, but with that higher and deeper knowledge and spiritual significance which God gives to those of His true servants who call upon Him for spiritual light, understanding and power. Like Ezra the priest, and Nehemiah the prophet who read the Scriptures in the ears of all the people, giving the sense, and causing the people to understand (Neh. 8:—) so we need to teach the people. They imparted the Word with its spiritual significance and personal application, and as a result “*The people wept before the Lord.*” As the Scripture is one continuous discourse about God—of His love and compassion for men—of His relation to us as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier; and on the other hand, of man’s sin and consequent depravity, his alienation from God and consequent need of a personal Saviour, there can be but one answer to the inquiry above raised, namely, “*Teach the Word.*” Teach it in the wisdom and with the

Spirit of God. So Christ taught, and it was said of Him, "Never man spake like this man." So Peter taught on the day of Pentecost, and three thousand of such as should be saved were added to the Church.

True there are those who are not content with the simple but earnest exposition of the Word, but from the merest mention of a text launch out in the rehearsal of frivolous anecdotes and the idle tales of men—a worse than waste of time and energy. And they usually find a large class of ready hearers. Of these Paul has long prophesied (2 Tim. 4:3), "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine ('Teaching'), but of their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." But the results of these teachers, as a rule, are as vain as their efforts to teach. But as the instructions of the true teacher are from God, so is the true teacher but the mouth-piece through whom God speaks His eternal truths to men. And as the written Word is but the external sign for the Spirit which is "*within, under, and through the Word,*" rendering it effectual unto every one that believeth, so the true teacher moved by the Holy Spirit of God is truly, "*A Teacher come from God.*" As such, the nature of his teaching is divine. An illustration may here serve our purpose: the electric machine, in its mechanical construction, is a marvel in the eyes of men for its precise and intricate mechanism. With every minutia of detail so accurately adjusted to every other part as to form one perfect unity, it stands as the wonder and admiration of men. But until you become a tangible unit with the machine and the current of electricity is turned on, the machine is powerless and as useless as it is harmless. But place yourself in contact with it, and turn on the current of electricity, and at once your whole system is wrought into a high tension of motion and activity. So God's plan of redemption, in a profound system of "Christo-centric" revelation, presents itself to the thoughtful and prayerful student as a profound system



of divine truth, resplendent with intricacies, mysteries, and marks of divinity on every hand. But only as the student of this profound plan gets into personal and experimental relation with the Holy Ghost—the Spirit of Revelation and power—will his inner nature be set in motion, and the veil over his “sanctum” of real knowledge be torn away and God’s machinery of divine revelation and grace begin to exercise in their proper functions upon the spiritual wisdom and energy of the soul. Saul of Tarsus, who sat at the feet of Gamaliel, learned and polished in all the learning and scholarship of the Jews, until brought face to face with God and the fundamental truths of His Gospel of salvation, was a persecutor instead of an executor of the Gospel of the Son of God. But when brought face to face with the glorified Christ and taught the way of salvation clearly, the scales fell from his eyes and he became the “Chief of the Apostles.” So ministers of the Gospel, to become effective teachers, need the learning and scholarship of our best institutions of higher education, but more than all, they need to get face to face with God within the veil, with personal visions of His power and glory in His Gospel to become proficient and effective teachers of the Word. With divine revelation and its Christ as the theme, himself touched and moved of God to teach, the nature of his teaching is a foregone conclusion.

But just here another inquiry may, with propriety, be raised, namely:

2. *In what capacity shall the minister of the Gospel serve as teacher?*

We answer, purely as a minister of the Gospel. Not indeed in a perfunctory routine of service: No, far from that! The professor in an institution of learning occupies his chair as a teacher in his own peculiar department. His work is circumscribed and limited. His day’s work done and his routine of duty has been discharged. But not so with the minister of the Gospel. It is his prerogative to exercise in the capacity of a teacher as no one else can. To the head of every home among the Israel-

ites God said (Deut. 6:6, 7) "And these words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up" What a charge to the head of every home this is! And what a corps of Christian teachers this world would have were the head of every Christian home true to the charge which God has here left him! But it is the prerogative of the minister of the Gospel to teach in a yet higher and far more extensive capacity as a teacher of the Word than the head of the home. For you will observe:

(1). That the office of the ministry is above that of the head of the home. The true minister of the Gospel, as a servant of God, is God's mouthpiece not only to the head of the home but to the Church. And as such he is to stand with the authority of God to teach all under his care.

(2). That the ministry is commissioned and authorized to deal with all the sacred and spiritual things of God's kingdom as no one else is. The office of the ministry is peculiar in itself in that it is vested with the profounder spiritual things of God's kingdom—not indeed after the manner of modern spiritualism, or the teaching of Christian Science, so called—but as God committed the profounder mysteries of His kingdom to the priesthood of the old dispensation, and to His disciples He gave new visions and deeper insight into the things hidden from the world, and special power to perform special spiritual functions, so to His true ministry He has committed functions peculiar to that sacred office.

(3). It is the prerogative of the minister of the Gospel to teach in a more general and extensive way than any one else can. By virtue of his office he has access to hearts as no one else can have as a rule. His scope of work is larger and on a larger scale. To him our Lord's charge (Mark 16:15) was, "Go into all the world and preach (teach) the Gospel to every creature." And



Paul's charge to Timothy (2 Epis. 4:2) was, "Preach (Teach) the Word be instant in season, and out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine (Teaching)." Hence with the larger field, endowed with special wisdom and power from God, vested not simply with His commission, but with special gifts of the Holy Ghost, it is the prerogative of the ministry of the Gospel to teach as no one else can.

It is true there are some, so-called ministers of the Gospel who are amply satisfied as having discharged their duty when they have spent an hour in the pulpit in a sort of popular oratory or harangue, with possibly no higher purpose than that of pleasing the audience and commanding a lucrative salary. But the true minister or teacher, called of God and sent forth by divine direction, can not rest satisfied even with the faithful preaching of the Word from the "Sacred Altar," but would teach wherever there is any one ready to be taught. The world's Greatest Teacher could not rest at ease in that capacity. But from the temple and the synagogue He went into the highways and hedges, among the poor and the sick, teaching in the home and by the wayside, in the mountains and by the sea—*everywhere* He taught the people the way of salvation. And so it is the prerogative of the true minister of the Gospel, moved by the same spirit with which He was moved, and acting in the light of His example, to act in the capacity of a teacher in the pulpit, in the Sunday School, in the prayer-meeting, in the home and on the street, in the highways and by the wayside: in short it is the prerogative of the true minister of the Gospel to teach the Word, wherever there is any one to be taught the way of the Lord. With the Bible as his text book, and the world as his class, every man of God, called to the office of the ministry, may go forth in the highest and grandest mission in which it is possible for any one to act. It is in this capacity in which God would have His ministering servants go forth.

But having now determined the nature of the teaching and capacity in which the minister of the Gospel should

teach, one more question may, with propriety, be raised, namely:

3. *To what extent should this teaching process be carried into the pulpit?*

While no definite rule may be prescribed, and no very definite answer made to this question, we can not emphasize too strongly the importance of the simpler and more direct unfolding and exposition of the truth of the Scriptures. The real idea of preaching after all finds its simpler form in teaching. And every sermon which is not, directly or indirectly, an exposition of God's Word, either fails of its purpose or the title has become a misnomer. For the present strong tendency to worldly-mindedness the only remedy is a more direct and pungent exposition and application of God's Word.

In Homiletics there are usually recognized three methods of sermonizing with which ministers of the Gospel are supposed to be thoroughly familiar, namely, the textual, topical and expository. And while the true all-round minister of the Gospel must needs use all three of these methods, that there has been a general turning aside from the old-time expository method of preaching is generally admitted. In fact, by some, it has been claimed that if there has been any weakening in power, or waning in influence of the pulpit in any way, it has been owing to this fact. But be this as it may, the one need of the hour is a more direct and pungent exposition of the Word of God. By this we do not mean an abrupt and abusive presentation, but a simple, plain and direct exposition of the whole Truth in the name of God, well tintured with His love, let it apply where and to whom it will. This was our Lord's method, and we certainly can not improve on Him. That in this method is vested the real strength and power of the true teacher is just as generally admitted as in the former case. Sacred history abounds with illustrations of this fact. Ezra, the Priest and Nehemiah (8:1-12) the Prophet came before the people, "both men and women, and all that could hear with understanding," that is young and old, \* \* "so they



read in the book of the Law distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." And what was the result? "*All the people wept.*" There was divine power in that service. Jonah (3:1-5) was commanded to go into Nineveh "and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee. So Jonah arose and went unto Nineveh according to the Word of the Lord. \* \* So the people of Nineveh believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even unto the least of them." Why such a startling effect upon this wicked city? The answer is evident: A message direct from God had been delivered to them. Our Lord Himself was content to expound "The Law and the Prophets" unto the multitudes and they were "pricked in their hearts," and the verdict of even the ungodly was, "Never man spake like this man." (John 7:46). It was after Peter's wonderful exposition of God's Word, "Beginning at Moses and the Prophets" that the "people were pricked in their hearts" and said, "men and brethren, what shall we do?" Felix trembled as Paul reasoned with him of "righteousness, temperance and judgment to come." Luther, Whitefield, Wesley and Beecher were among the great expository preachers during the more crucial periods of spiritual revolution and reformation in the more recent centuries, with the results familiar to all Christian students. Hence to the question before us we answer:

(1). That the teaching process should be carried into the pulpit as far as may be necessary to present plainly and fully the true meaning of the Scriptures. We can not emphasize too strongly Paul's exhortation not only to "preach the Word, but also to "Teach it." We need the "Didaskein" as well as the "Kerusein." That is we must have the teaching as well as the proclaiming or preaching.

(2). That we need more of the expository preaching of the Gospel. With the present standard of intelligence among the laity and in the world our public congregations comprehend readily not only the simple, saving truths of

the Gospel, but are easily able to grapple with the profounder truths couched in the general narrative of the Scriptures. And a careful and analytical study of the Scriptures by the pastor will enable him, like our Lord, or like Peter on the day of Pentecost, "Beginning at Moses and the Prophets" to expound unto the people the profounder truths of the Bible unto the salvation of many unsaved, and unto the edification of the Church.

(3). That in topical preaching the homiletical arrangement should be such as to make the topic only the center thread around which to weave God's Word in its exposition and practical application. In short, unravel and explain the subject from the Bible. The one greatest of all the needs of the day by the ministry and the laity is a more careful and thorough teaching of the Word of God. This done and God will take of the results; and daily such will be added to the Church as shall be saved. May God give His ministering servants and the laity of the Church more of the genuine teaching capacity! Amen!

*Wellington, Kansas.*



## ARTICLE IX.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER.

One of the anxious inquiries which the great world-war has awakened is in regard to its effect on Christian Missions. The problem is discussed by Henry Churchill King, of Oberlin College, in *The American Journal of Theology* (Jan.) He believes, with many others, that the real trouble with the human race is that there has been no consistent and radical trial of the spirit and principles of Christ in the whole realm of human life. Christianity has been tried only half-way, and this is far harder than whole-way Christianity. Missions are the surest test and best manifestation of the Christian spirit. In missions we have the best and purest revelation of our holy religion. If it fail here, it fails altogether. It is worth while to know what missions have to teach us in this world-shaking crisis. They emphasize *the things which cannot be shaken*.

1. Missions show that civilization can not save the world unless it be permeated through and through with the truly Christian spirit. The modern world seems to have advanced more rapidly in its discovery of mighty physical forces than in moral control. The mighty engine has no controlling governor.

2. The second of the things which cannot be shaken which God has been teaching us through this world devastating war is *the inescapable grip of the laws of God* in the life of nations as well as of individuals. The law of cause and effect is operative on a large as well as on a small scale. Whatsoever men or nations sow that shall they also reap.

3. The third of the things which cannot be shaken is the intolerable inconsistency of the selfish antagonism inevitably expressed in the war. The war is continually

contradicting itself. Every one of the nations in the war is using scientific principles, methods and devices originated by one or the other of its foes. Co-operation in the use of every discovery for the good of all is contradicted by war.

4. The fourth thing which the war emphasizes is the demand for "mental and spiritual fellowship among men, and mental and spiritual independence on the part of the individual." The Teutonic Allies have put their emphasis on fellowship—the closest scientific co-operation, the English and French on individual independence. Both emphases are necessary for the full realization of the ideal humanity.

5. The fifth fact is plain—God is sifting out the true from the false Christianity. Tested by their fruits, multitudes are not Christian. There must be a return to Christ and His teachings.

6. "So, applying the standards of Christ, it should be unmistakably plain, that however one expresses the missionary aim, it cannot be harmonized with an exclusive patriotism or nationalism, or with an exclusive race pride and prejudice within the nation."

7. "This world crisis should not pass without bringing the common standards of our civilization into far greater consistency with our missionary aim and motive."

8. Finally, it should not be possible that the Christian Church should go through such a world-crisis as the present and not learn lessons which vitally affect its world-task. Missionary reconstruction on an undreamed-of scale may result. (a) Co-operation among all the forces of righteousness to resist the frightful power of the destructive forces disclosed and illustrated by the war. (b) Christianity must lay greater stress on the ethical and social elements of the Christian message. (c) The Church, which alas, has counted for so little for international good-will in this war, must seek to create some definitely constructive agency through which hereafter good-will shall act. Do not the Mission Boards afford the national agency through which this good-will



should make itself felt? (d) There must be a unifying of Christian forces on the mission field. (e) There must be a new and higher appreciation of the values of alien people and a new determination to respect and guard these values. (f) The mission forces must promote personal reconciliations and relations, and must aim at a deeper spiritual unity.

---

We quote from a significant article in *The American Journal of Theology* the following paragraphs on "Russian Liberal Theology" by A. Palmeri:

"For about a thousand years," Menshikov wrote lately in the *Novoe Vermia*, "orthodoxy has existed among the Russian people. For about a thousand years the poorly educated but devout clergymen have been able to communicate their faith to the good-hearted and ignorant people. But something catastrophic has happened, and this great religious mood began to die out, at first among the aristocracy, then among the intellectual classes, then among the clergy. Finally, when the pastors began to desert their charges, their flocks also scattered."

The pessimistic forebodings of the Russian publisher are not the declarations of a mind imbued with preconceived religious opinions, nor the shout of alarm of a timid heart, for Menshikov boasts of being a constant and true son of the Russian orthodox church. On the contrary, his words are the sincere expression of an evolution of Russian religious consciousness which is taking place among the leading classes in the social and literary life of Russia. Notwithstanding the firmly planted roots of its historical past, the gorgeous pomp of its liturgy, the unsurpassed beauty of its religious chants, and the majestic splendor of its rites; notwithstanding its political value as the predominating state religion and its naturalization in the Russian soul, orthodox Christianity in Russia is facing a serious crisis.

Russian writers, clinging to the ancient religious traditions of their own country, cannot refrain from lampooning with pungent witticisms and gibes the Russian

aristocrats who leave their native soil to kill time in the perverse atmosphere of the most corrupted European centers, affecting German or French. The worst of it is that they make little of the orthodox inheritance of their forefathers and fall a prey to the basest materialism, or are lost in the maze of agnosticism, or betray both Russian fatherland and Russian Church by enslaving their minds under Roman Catholicism. The Russian aristocracy is indeed orthodox in name, but they no longer quench their thirst at the wellsprings of the Christian life.

The higher intellectual classes, in turn, feel a contempt for the church which nourished them. Russian universities, too, are the sanctuaries of deified reason. In their halls Christ no longer utters His appeals, while religious oddities and fancies and the extravagances of philosophers are taught to a youth morally perverted and mentally stumbling in darkness. To quote a just expression of Rt. Rev. Sergius, archbishop of Finland, "We are now witnessing in Russia a divorce between Church and intelligence, and the responsibility for that moral gloom hinges largely upon the ignorance and clumsiness of the Russian clergy." Sacred learning, with the exception of the Canon Law, church history, and a rudimentary course of Christian apologetics, has been put under ban by the universities. Theological studies are frowned upon as a dialectical game of diseased minds or of sophists in idle moments. Christianity is not inwardly lived within the Russian orthodox Church. Theological papers have a very small circulation. Suffice it to say that the *Ecclesiastical Messenger* of Sergiev Posad, the leading organ of Russian thought counts only 1,500 subscribers.

---

Prof. Carl Holliday, of the University of Montana, has been investigating the "Religious Beliefs in American Colleges" and writes about them in *The Hibbert Journal* (Jan.) He says:

"Certainly one of the doctrines of these young intel-



lects is that the preaching heard in the churches does not square with the conclusions of the laboratories and the expressions of the poets and philosophers in the university library. Of this these college men seem positive, and they prefer to believe the experiments, the poets, and the philosophers. Indeed, it must be admitted that they imply, if they do not openly express, considerable scorn for the average preacher, whose training in literature and especially in the sciences strikes them as scarcely on a par with that of a sophomore, and whose delivery and keenness of thought are not equal to those of many of the professors whom the students hear daily."

"There was a time when the preacher's voice was the voice of God; to this generation of college students it is the voice simply of a man whose intellect, training, knowledge of the laws of life, and ability to interpret are no better than those of the students themselves."

"Hence, the average man student strikes out for himself in the matter of beliefs. And what are these beliefs? Undoubtedly he has concluded that there is a God. In fifteen years of college work I have not found an infidel among students; their studies have led them to agree that all science must take for granted a First Great Cause, call it God, or what you will. Nor have I found a student who did not believe in a Hereafter. And as to the character of this Eternity, they are indeed far more positive in their conclusions than the average outsider. As many have expressed it to me, their 'sense of fairness' demands a Heaven and a Hell, but I have found very few students who considered these other than *states of conscience after death*. As one said, 'I believe that every mortal who has done wrong must pass through a condition of conscience known as hell before entering the opposite condition of conscience known as heaven.' In all my experience as a teacher I have found but three male students who believed in an *eternal* hell; but I must confess that I have found a fairly large number of young college women who have never doubted it. Various reasons for their own belief have been advanced by the men,

but in the main these summed up in the two conclusions: 'A Perfect God could not countenance eternal torture,' and 'God could not be considered victorious and perfect as long as suffering and rebellion existed in His universe.' "

"Therefore these college men, as I have known them, are almost unanimous in the doctrine that *all* souls will finally reach the condition known as heaven. These young thinkers do not doubt that some souls shall experience this condition *later* than others; for, as they argue, because of the very nature of the human conscience which has been outraged here on earth, the period of chastening and learning and evolving must be much longer for some spirits."

"How do these young men *know* these things? They simply answer that they have thought it out this way. Often the college girls have replied to my inquiry, 'The Bible says so'; but seldom indeed has a college man answered me thus. And this leads to the second point, 'What are college men thinking of the Bible?' It would surprise some pessimistic preachers to know how appreciative many a college man is of the Bible as a keen, deep, subtle and beautiful *expression*. In my teaching experience I have found innumerable young men who spoke with enthusiasm of the Psalms, the Book of Job, the Sermon on the Mount, as marvellous *expressions* of the human heart; but that the book is *infallible* truth from cover to cover, there your young college man takes issue."

In regard to the foregoing it may be said that the opinions of young men at college are not to be taken too seriously for their intrinsic value, but are to be weighed carefully for their probable influence on the young men themselves and on their generation. We would prescribe first of all good Christian professors, earnest Bible study, and a strong course in apologetics. Butler's Analogy would not come amiss.

---

"What a Painter Taught and Preached," *Methodist Review* (Jan.) is related by the Rev. S. T. Jackson, who



was the pastor of the late distinguished painter, William Merritt Chase.

"When I was a youngster in Indianapolis," said Mr. Chase, "I was ambitious to be a student in the school of a certain artist of that city. I took him some of my best work. He looked at it with a frown and said: 'Young fellow, your work shows no sign of a future artist. I have no time to bother with you.' I shall never forget to my dying day how I felt that morning. I knew my own heart and mind, and I was determined though turned down to get up and go to work with greater vim and vigor than ever before. I found an artist who gave me a place in his studio, and it was not long ere the one who turned me down was glad to come and study my sketches." I walked with him through his studio, catching every word that fell from his lips. It was honey on every flower. He said: "I found out when young if I expected to be an artist I must pay the price. I knew no one would lie awake at nights thinking about me becoming an artist, unless it was my sacred mother. I said to myself before I left for Munich, Germany: 'Chase, if you wish to succeed in Europe, you must go and begin at the very bottom of the ladder and work your way, round by round, and even build the ladder by which you climb.' If anyone ever paid the price for success I did. I labored for eight years almost unnoticed, until one day my instructor came and gave me commission to paint his children. This was the turn in the tide."

Here he paused, then turned toward me, and continued: "You are young in your profession. I would impress upon your mind that your rise or fall will not depend on your Bishop, or on the one who precedes or follows you; it will depend on you absolutely. Never blame others for your failure. That man who does not reach the top through his own ability and persistent endeavor will not remain there. Learn this lesson of life, that no one can keep you down but yourself."

---

"The Bible and Archaeological Discoveries," by Dr.

Melvin G. Kyle of Xenia, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Jan.) deals with matters of perennial interest. He says in part:

“On one occasion, when about to go into the Desert of Sinai, I asked one familiar with the region to suggest the best guidebook for the journey. Would I best get the German work, Baedeker?” “No,” said he, though himself a German, “The Book of Exodus is the best guidebook for the Sinai journey.” And I found it so. Every important point is found in exactly the right order and at the right distance. People far away may speculate learnedly about the identification of the region and the comparative merits of this or that proposed route, but I have never known any one who went over this route with the Book of Exodus in hand who was not convinced that this is the way that Israel came.

The Israel tablet found by Professor Petrie harmonizes best with the facts of history otherwise known, when it is recognized that the fifth year of Merenptah mentioned in the tablet was also the fifth year of the leadership of Moses, as recorded in the Pentateuch: one year after the death of the king that sought Moses' life, for Moses to settle up his affairs in Midian and return to Egypt; one year for the Plagues, as clearly indicated in the Biblical record and the round of natural events that embodied the plagues; two years for the journey through the wilderness and the sojourn at Sinai until Israel was turned back at Kadesh-barnea, at the beginning of the fifth year. Thus the poetic announcement of the inscription of Merenptah, “Israel is ruined, her seed is not; Palestine is become as the widows of Egypt,” is the proud boast of the Pharaoh that Israel had failed to enter the land at Kadesh-barnea, because of the weakening of the strength of the nation by the destroying of the boy babies, in the diabolical Egyptian scheme to make Israel characteristically a nation of women.

Not only does the testimony of archaeological discoveries, but of modern missionary research in comparative religion as well, sustain the Biblical claim for its mis-



sionary propaganda, that "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved"; "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Now that we have set the Bible in the light of archaeological discovery, how does it appear?

Mohammedans of Bible lands are wont to say to Christians, with boastful sneer, "At our holy place we have bones to show, but you Christians have only an empty tomb at Jerusalem." Yes, thank God, an empty tomb, out of which the living Lord, and with him Christianity, came to stand in the light of the resurrection. Archaeological discovery is a literary resurrection, and the Bible, the written Word, in the light of archaeological discovery stands out in glory, as the living Word in the light of the resurrection.

---

Dr. Charles W. Super of Athens, Ohio, inquires in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, "Has the World Entered a Moral Interregnum?"

Among his answers he speaks as follows:

No American of standing believes that might makes right, as has been proved repeatedly in our diplomatic relations with smaller nations. We have steadfastly insisted that disagreements could and should be adjusted by peaceful means. No other country has been so liberal with its gifts for benevolent objects both domestic and foreign. No other people have given so much money for the support of foreign missions, with all that they imply. We are steadfastly giving more and more proofs of sanity and safety of our democracy. Great as has been the liberality of our people, it is still far short of what it should be. We should recognize that it is in a large measure incumbent upon us to rebuild the countries devastated by war both in Europe and on this continent.

There will be no moral interregnum, as surely there need not be, if Americans do their duty.

Recent observers have reported the existence of widespread pessimism in the neutral countries of the Eastern Hemisphere. This is probably due to the fact that the minds of the warring nations are kept so tense by the hope of victory or the fear of defeat and the necessity of finding a livelihood that they have little time to think of other matters. In the very nature of the case some of them are destined to a bitter disillusionment, more bitter than any they have as yet experienced. It is not putting the case too strong to say that if the spirit of Christianity or even the sentiment of humaneness and international charity, are to survive, the preservation of these virtues will devolve upon the leadership of the American people; and not upon the churches only, as there are large resources in the hands of men who acknowledge no affiliation with any religious body. For more than two years it has been evident that the people of Europe have entered a period during which moral sanctions are for the most part in abeyance. But there is no reason why this period should be more than an interregnum, nor why it should long endure.

---

Dr. Philip Schaff's attitude toward the Germans in America is spoken of by his son David S. Schaff in the *Reformed Church Review* (Jan.) as follows:

This liberty was next shown in the attitude he took towards the German element in America. Very soon, Dr. Schaff announced it as his conclusion that it was unwise to attempt to transplant the German language and also German religious institutions without modification in this country. It was in the line of Providence for the German element, so he thought, to adapt itself to the new conditions found in this land. In spite of the condemnation which these views brought upon him, they meant for him no abatement of his love for the people among whom he had been trained and whose usages he respected. On one of his journeys in Europe he wrote in his diary: "I



will find, as I go on, that for England and Scotland, I am too much of a German and for Germany I am too much of an Englishman and for all too much of an American." Fulcher of Charters, writing at the end of the First Crusade of himself and of others who were making Palestine their home, said, "We who were Westerners are now Easterners. We have forgotten our former country." The attitude which Dr. Schaff maintained during his life in America was an entirely different one. He preferred his new home, but he never outgrew his warm attachment to friends in the old world and the old world itself.

---

In the same review Robt. F. Reed writes concerning "The Function of the Church To-day" in reference to social service:

There is no reason why members of the church may not ally themselves with extra-ecclesiastical organizations whose main object is to bring about the ends of social service; to do for men all that the champions of social service want the church herself to accomplish in this respect. In fact, I fail to see how people can be faithful members of the church and not heed the repeated calls coming to them from society for help of all descriptions at this time. And the Word of God is not preached as faithfully as it behooves us to preach it unless we try to get men to come to the conviction that it is their duty to be thorough Christians in their day, and as such wield an unalloyed influence for good among men and women in all strata of society. It is altogether likely that work of this kind can be done more effectively where people enter upon it banded together into some sort of organization than it can be done by them as individuals. Christians can accomplish far more because they are united into one body than they could bring about as so many separate units. So also can the work to be done along the line of social service be accomplished best if men unitedly undertake the tasks that they have mapped out for themselves in this realm of activity. Only it is well for us at all times to remember that the Church herself was not called

into being for this end; that Christians are not organized primarily for social service. They like their Master have a loftier aim in life.

---

The Quadri-centennial of the Reformation is the theme of many articles in the various Reviews. *The Reformed Church Review* very naturally dwells upon the Reformation in Switzerland. The Rev. Henry H. Ranck lauds "Zwingli, Reformer and Modern." He writes:

Zwingli and Calvin were the founders of the Reformed branch of Protestantism, and with Luther are recognized as the great leaders of the Reformation. The significance and uniqueness of Zwingli and his teaching are often obscured by the greatness of the other two. Luther was certainly the greatest of them all. In him pre-eminently was the movement embodied. Martin Luther was the religious Roosevelt of the Reformation with a passionate vision of the truth, keen sympathy for and understanding of the common folk, a boundless energy and capacity for work, and a marvelous power to stir and lead the people. Zwingli, too, was a popular leader but the arena of his activity was much smaller, the German cantons of Eastern Switzerland. Zwingli's life was cut short by his death on the battle field in 1531 after less than fifteen years activity as an original Reformer, yet with remarkable clearness, consistency and completeness had he wrought out his system. Luther labored on fifteen years longer.

Hulderich Zwingli was the sanest and most clear headed of all the Reformers. He was the man of sober practical common sense. He had little of the mystic vein in him as Luther had. However, there was not a taint of fanaticism upon him. He gave reason its proper place. Dr. Schaff calls him a "forerunner of modern liberal theology." If the Reformers were to come back and live with us in this twentieth century, Zwingli would be the one most at home. He was a religious progressive and it is to those particulars wherein he was ahead of even the Protestantism of his time that I wish specially to call attention.



We can understand a man only in the light of his training and the atmosphere of his rearing. When we see how Zwingli loved the classics and was a disciple of Erasmus we can more readily understand his liberal spirit. If he was a practical leader and stressed conduct, which Matthew Arnold says is three-fourths of life, we will be sure that he was influenced by the noble ethics of the old stoics.

Prof. G. W. Richards of the Reformed Seminary, Lancaster, in an article on "Zwingli, Calvin and the Reformed Church," published in the *Homiletic Review* (March), presents his view of the difference of attitude between the Lutheranism and the Reformed.

The formative principle of the doctrine and life of the Reformed Church is the sovereignty of God and the authority of the Word of God, the twin premises of Calvinism. The controlling doctrine of the Lutheran Church is justification by faith. The one emphasizes in the process of salvation the sovereignty of grace the other the sufficiency of faith, the divine and the human side of salvation, respectively. Both agree that God is the source of grace and the author of faith, but they differ in emphasis on the two aspects of justification, grace proceeding from God according to his inscrutable will, and faith effected in man through the gospel of Jesus. In the one the doctrine of election becomes central and assurance of salvation is based on it. In the other the doctrine of justification is central and salvation is assured through the sacraments. Calvinism finds assurance of perseverance in God's will, Lutheranism has the assurance of salvation, not of perseverance, in man's faith.

The Church, according to the Reformed theory, is a community of the elect, according to the Lutherans a community of believers. The elect are directly governed by the Word of God, which contains the laws for individual and communal life under the power of God's Word. The mission of the Church, therefore, is to glorify God by the full dominion of His will on the earth.

The Reformed churches retained in their forms of wor-

ship only that which was commanded in the New Testament. They were rigidly anti-Catholic and strictly Biblical. Altars, pictures, images, crucifixes, candles, organs, hymns, and priestly vestments were regarded as remains of Roman idolatry, and were removed from the churches. They detract from the glory of God and hinder the immediate and free activity of the Holy Spirit in the members of the congregation. The Lutheran and Episcopalian Churches kept in their liturgies many of the rites and ceremonies of Catholicism on the ground that they were not opposed to the spirit of the New Testament and that they served to edify the congregations. In their retention, however, of a regularly ordained and educated ministry, of the preaching of the Word, of catechetical instruction, of the sacraments, and of the necessity of Christian nurture through parents in the home, teachers in the schools and ministers in congregations, the Reformed Churches held common ground with Lutherans and Episcopalians, while they separated sharply from the Anabaptist radicals and the mystics who were inclined to deny the necessity of the Written Word, creeds, and educated ministry, catechisms, schools, and the sacraments.

The life of the Reformed Church found logical expression in Puritanism. While the Lutherans were disposed to be content with emphasizing the experience of divine grace in the forgiveness of sin, and the constant renewal of that experience, in the sacraments, the Reformed insisted on the application of the will of God in the daily life of the individual and in the government of society. Lutheranism, with its deep, inward piety, its mystic and contemplative spirit which throbs in its hymns, its devotional literature, and its wealth of liturgical forms, lacked a positive interest in the social and political reforms. The Calvinists from the beginning attempted a reconstruction of social and political institutions in the light of Christian ideals.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*



## ARTICLE X.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

MARSHALL JONES CO. BOSTON.

*The Mythology of All Races: Indian and Iranian.* Volume vi of the Series of Thirteen Volumes, under the general editorship of Louis Herbert Gray, and George Foot Moore, Consulting Editor. The Indian Mythology is contributed by Dr. A. Berriedale Keith, Professor of Sanscrit in Edinburgh University. The Iranian Mythology is contributed by Professor Albert J. Carnoy of the Universities of Louvain, and Pennsylvania. Cloth. Pp. ix, 404. Size 6½ x 9½ inches. Illustrated.

The Indian and Iranian Mythology are full of deep interest because of their abiding hold upon the people of India and Persia. The former mythology has been in constant and organic development for thirty-five hundred years. Though India has often been invaded, especially in the north-west, and though Islam has made some inroads and though Christianity has contributed some elements to the faith of the people, particularly in the south, nevertheless India yet remains to a large extent under the dominion of its ancient beliefs. From the rich field of literature the author has limited himself to the choice of such myths only as reflect the Indian ideas on religion, and on the origin and destiny of the universe.

The author doubts whether there is any evidence that Christianity exerted any influence on India in the apostolic period, though later Christian communities were located on the Malabar coast. Apparent Christian sources of a few myths are probably nothing more than parallel with native sources. The theory that the child god in India is borrowed from the youthful Christ cannot be substantiated, yet there is evidence that the Christian religion affected the theology and cult of Krsna, whose name is pronounced Krsta in many parts of India.

The Iranian myths reflect the Persian dualism—the contests between the Good and the Evil Spirits.

All these myths show the effort of the human mind to

account for the various phenomena of nature and of human existence.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

*Introduction to Lutheran Symbolics.* A Historical Survey of the Oecumenical and Particular Creeds of the Lutheran Church, an Outline of Their Contents, and an Interpretation of Their Theology on the Basis of the Doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. By J. L. Neve, D.D., Professor of Symbolics and History of Doctrines in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, with contributions by George J. Fritschel, D.D., Professor of Church History and Symbolics, in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. Cloth. Pp. vii. 439. Price \$1.75.

This work on Lutheran Symbolics is the result of careful study of the subject and its application in the classroom. It is now offered as a text-book and will no doubt be used in whole or part by some of our Seminaries. As far as we know this is the first venture to cover Lutheran Symbolics in an English text-book, and as such it will serve a useful purpose. Future editions will probably contain some changes in treatment as well as in language; but the present work will stimulate interest and act as a guide in the study of our Confessions. There are numerous valuable notes, indicating sources and giving side-lights on the main discussion.

One half of the entire treatise is devoted to the Augsburg Confession. Special emphasis is thus laid upon the chief and generic Lutheran symbol. The revival of interest in our confessions during the last generation has already produced rich results and the present volume will promote their intelligent study on the part of pastors and students.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE ABINGDON PRESS. NEW YORK.

*Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.* By Orton H. Carmichael. Nineteen Illustrations. Cloth, 8mo. Pp. 116. Price 85 cents net.

The Rev. Orton H. Carmichael has prepared in "Lin-



coln's Gettysburg Address" an interesting account of the evolution and delivery of our most admired and beloved national address. Not the least interesting of his chapters is that which describes the effect of the speech upon the audience, a subject upon which there has been varying testimony. Mr. Carmichael concludes that on the whole the impression was favorable though many were disappointed by Lincoln's brevity. He gives as an illustration of the opposite feeling a paragraph from the reckless pen of a Democratic editor.

"We pass over the silly remarks of the President; for the credit of the nation we are willing that the veil of oblivion shall drop over them and that they shall be no more repeated or thought of."

The little book is thoroughly illustrated. The author has spared no pains to make his investigation thorough and his statements authentic and has produced in consequence a valuable monograph.

E. L. S.

*When Christ Comes Again.* By the Rev. George P. Eckman. Cloth. Pp. 287. Index. Price \$1.25 net.

This is an excellent contribution to the literature of the Second Advent from the pen of a pastor, who writes in a simple and interesting way for plain people. It is in the nature of a serious discussion of a great truth from the standpoint of the orthodox teaching. It is a capital answer to premillennialism, and at the same time a constructive treatment of a blessed doctrine, often misunderstood or undervalued. Where the persistence of the so-called "Second Adventists" has disturbed a community the circulation of this book will act as a corrective.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

*The Enlarging Conception of God.* By Herbert Alden Youtz, Professor of Christian Theology in Auburn Theological Seminary. Cloth. Pp. 199. Price 50c.

Written in simple and excellent English, Professor Youtz's book leads to nothing, as far as we can see. He denounces the old theology and then proclaims its great teachings! He finds fault with its reliance upon the Bible and then rests upon it! It is true that in the spirit of small adventure he sometimes leaves the beaten track, but he usually returns very soon. The so-called old the-

ology is conceived of as static, while the new is the theology of growth. The old relies upon Scripture—sometimes mechanically interpreted—the new upon—what? The answer is Darwinism and Experience! Darwinism, whether true or false, or evolution is after all only a method of creation which really has nothing to do with the fundamental ideas of theology. It seems to us that the antagonists of the old theology are often fighting a man of straw, unless they deny the inspiration of the Bible altogether. In the latter case they cease to be theologians. True theology holds fast to the eternal verities as taught in the Bible and it goes forward in a path that shines more and more unto the day of perfect knowledge.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Paul's Doctrine of Redemption.* By Henry Beach Carre, B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Vanderbilt University. Cloth. Pp. 175. Price 50c.

This is a scholarly attempt to show that Paul taught that the redemption wrought by Christ was a "redemption of the cosmos" as well as that of man. This indeed is plainly set forth by Paul. The author, however, believes that we can understand Paul only by knowing "his world philosophy." This was essentially dualistic—a cosmic "struggle between the Devil and his hosts, on one side, and God on the other. Satan and God—these were the protagonists. Man played a secondary part. He was drawn into the cosmic drama by no act of his own, but by an accident, or misfortune, in the yielding of the first pair to the seductions of Satan." Following certain German writers, Dr. Carre holds "that with Paul Sin and Death were from a certain point of view, hypostases, existences, beings or personalities."

In reference to the Atonement the author rejects the sacrificial theory and maintains the ethical. Man must be propitiated, not God! Where Paul's thought fails to conform to Dr. Carre's ideas, "Paul's logic is defective!" The average reader understands Paul, but will have difficulty in understanding Carre.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE NEW ERA PRINTING CO. LANCASTER, PA.

*The German Element in York Co., Pa.* By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, B.D., Ph.D. Cloth. 8mo. Pp. 217. Price \$1.00.

The material for this volume was gathered in prepara-



tion for a doctor's degree, and seldom does a thesis contain so much that is interesting to the general reader as well as valuable to the historian. The author has breathed into a mass of dry facts, carefully gathered from the office of the recorder, the archives of the historian and the crackling pages of old letters, the breath of life, so that the pioneers of this interesting section of Pennsylvania become real and living.

It has been supposed that the first settlers of York County, John and James Hendricks, were Englishmen, but Doctor Wentz offers equally good evidence to prove them Germans. Certainly the many settlers who followed them were Germans. Following the ancient Indian trail, now known as the Monocacy Road, already trod by the Mennonites who went from Lancaster County to visit their fellow believers in Virginia, the Germans established their homes first in the neighborhood of what is now Wrightsville, then in the neighborhood of what is now Hanover, and then on the site of present York. Pious, thrifty and thoroughly acquainted with the science of farming, these early settlers chose, not the thinly forested or unforested and therefore easily tillable land, but those sections with fine trees, springs and streams which reminded them of the fertile Palatinate which they had left. Here, disturbed by the border disputes between Pennsylvania and Maryland and often annoyed by the uncertainties about titles to property which are so often one of the trials of the pioneer, they began the solid and admirable work which made of the section which they had chosen one of the great granaries of the world.

To a detailed account of the settlement of York County Doctor Wentz adds an illuminating statement of the conditions in Germany which impelled the thousands of emigrants to leave the country which they had so dearly loved for the hardships and perils of a long sea voyage and the uncertain conditions of a new land.

The volume is excellently printed and is furnished with interesting illustrations of colonial money, coats of arms, an ancient map, and, as frontispiece, an old picture of York.

For members of the Lutheran Church the volume has an especial interest. The pioneers of York County were largely Lutherans and have thousands of living Lutheran descendants. The establishment of the Lutheran churches followed closely upon the first settlement, and the first church organization of any denomination west of

the Susquehanna River was that gathered by Pastor John Caspar Stoeber along the Codorus Creek in 1733.

E. S. L.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*Apologetics or a System of Christian Evidence.* By Conrad Emil Lindberg, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Augustana Theological Seminary. Cloth. Pp. 216. Price \$1.50 net.

The subject of Apologetics is treated by Dr. Lindberg in a very comprehensive way. After establishing the usual theistic grounds, he proceeds to prove the inspiration and authenticity of the Scriptures. This is followed by a rational defence of particular biblical doctrines. Much stress is laid upon the value of Christian experience. The book is the result of class room work, and is offered as a text-book. It will commend itself to the general reader, even more than to the teacher, for each teacher has usually his own method of presenting his theme. It is a good book for pastors who will find it a convenient hand-book of Apologetics.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

BROCHURES.

*Gardening and Out-of-Doors*, by the Rev. P. C. Croll, D.D., pastor of the Lutheran Church at Beardstown, Ill. Paper. Pp. 76. Price 25 cents.

Dr. Croll furnishes a treat in his little book, which gives us a glimpse of nature and human nature through the eyes of a good man. The sketches are enriched with poetry and adorned with pictorial illustrations. Dr. Croll's personal friends will be glad for the pictures and allusions to the dear ones of his own household. The booklet is a simple and happy expression of a joyful, optimistic spirit.

*Church Management.* By Rev. W. W. Frey. Pp. 22. Paper. Lutheran Publication Society, Phila., Pa.

This is one of a series of Lutheran Monographs written by a wide-awake pastor in a simple style. It gives exactly what the title indicates—an outline of how to manage a congregation so as to make it efficient. It should be widely circulated.



# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY 1917.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### BAPTISM.<sup>1</sup>

ARTICLE IX OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

BY JOHN WAGNER, D.D.

“Of Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that through Baptism is offered the grace of God; and that children are to be baptized, who, being offered to God through Baptism, are received into His grace.

They condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the Baptism of children, and say that children are saved without Baptism.”

In the Historical Introduction to his edition of the Symbolical Books, Müller has well said, “The Church does not wish to ascribe to her symbols immutable authority.” Equally pertinent and pithy are the words of Dr. Jacobs in his Preface to the Book of Concord, “The Holy Scriptures are the sole source and authority of the Church’s teaching. \* \* \* Confessions are authoritative, not because the Church has adopted them, but because of the Word of God which they are found to contain.” In lay-

<sup>1</sup> Lecture on the Holman Foundation, delivered at the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 8, 1917.

ing down the rule or standard whereby, according to God's Word, all doctrines should be judged, the Formula of Concord itself declares, "We confessionally accept also the first unaltered Augsburg Confession not because it was composed by our theologians, but because it has been derived from God's Word." The Augustana, a creed of marvelous perfection, was not written by inspired men.

First and foremost among the cardinal principles of the Reformation, whose quadricentennial the Protestant world is this year engaged in celebrating, stands the sole authority of the Holy Scriptures. This was the formal principle of that great religious revolution inaugurated October 31, 1517.

Over against the traditionalism taught by the Church of Rome, which practically puts the decrees of the Pope and of Councils not only on an equality with the Scriptures but above them, and thus makes the word of man the arbiter of the Word of God, Luther lifted again the Divine standard, and made the Bible "the only and last court of appeal in all matters pertaining to Christian creed and deed, and thus re-established the confession and the faith of the Church upon the only safe and unshaken foundation, the revealed Word of the ever-living God." (Schodde).

Throughout all time the Word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, must be the one sole test of our Protestant Christianity. Tried by this test, it may be confidently affirmed that the Augsburg Confession needs no revision. In the increasing light of the centuries since it was formulated, so faultless in essentials has it been found to be, "so in harmony with the Church's growing apprehension of the Word of God that it remains untouched by the later exegesis and the higher criticism of that word."

That Article IX of the Confession is in perfect accord with the teachings of the Book by inspiration given, will now be our task to demonstrate.



## I. WHAT IS BAPTISM?

Let this be our first inquiry. Misconception of its true nature will and must result in a misapprehension of the benefits of baptism. This fact is the sufficient explanation of the widely divergent views as to the efficacy of the sacraments held by different branches of the Church. Failing to grasp its real meaning Zwingli saw in baptism only an empty ceremony. Reformed churches persistently deny the communication of divine grace through the holy Sacraments, and accordingly these appear to them impotent rites, whose value can only be that of a sign or symbol, like that of a crucifix on the altar or a picture on the wall. The Quakers who have no love for crucifixes and pictures, or any form of art, are the most consistent in their advocacy and practice of the Reformed theology when they reject the use of the sacraments entirely.

It is not strange, therefore, that in not a few Reformed churches the baptism of infants is sadly neglected, notwithstanding their recognition of it as a divinely-appointed sacrament. Why baptize if baptism is a mere symbol, destitute of any deep signification and of all saving grace? When Rationalism sets at naught the teaching of Holy Scripture, sets the blindness of the natural man against the light of Revelation which shines supernaturally from heaven, it is obviously difficult to persuade parents to present their children to God in an ordinance in which they can discern no spiritual blessing.

They who look upon baptism as no more than an outward rite, or a mark of profession, with a strange inconsistency recognize it, however, as a sacrament, and as such speak of it as a means of grace. What is a means of grace but a channel or vehicle by which grace is communicated? If the commonly accepted definition of a sacrament as a visible sign of an invisible grace is Scripturally correct, then through baptism the grace of God is offered, as taught in the Article under consideration; and not only is grace thus offered, it is also most certainly imparted to everyone who believes, as the Word and promise



of God declare. This is what the Word of God distinctly declares: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16:16. "Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the Word." Ephesians 5:25-26. (American Revision.) In exact accord, therefore, with scripture teaching is Luther's answer to the question: "What is baptism?" "Baptism is not simply water, but it is the water comprehended in God's command and connected with God's Word." And in his Large Catechism, Luther adds: "Therefore I exhort that these two, the water and the Word, be by no means separated. For if the Word be taken away the water is the same as that which the servant cooks and may be called a bath-keeper's baptism.

"But when the Word is added as God has ordained, it is a sacrament and is called Christian baptism. \* \* Therefore, it is pure wickedness and blasphemy of the devil, that now our new spirits mock at baptism, separate it from God's Word and institution, and regard nothing but the water which is taken from the well; and then they prate and say; how is a handful of water to save souls? Yes, indeed, my friends, who does not know as much as that, that if they be separate from one another, water is water? But how dare you thus interfere with God's order and tear out the most precious jewel with which God has connected it and set it, and which He will not have separated? For the germ in the water is God's Word and command and the name of God which is a treasure greater and nobler than heaven and earth. Thus we now comprehend the difference, that baptism is quite another thing from all other water. \* \* \* Hence also it derives its character as a sacrament, as St. Augustine also taught: "Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum."—"When the word is joined to the element it becomes a sacrament."

This view of the nature of baptism is the one that was held by most of the patristic writers of the Church. Tertullian (III, 1131), writes, "He who was sanctified by



baptism, laying aside his sins and spiritually renewed, was made fit to receive the Holy Spirit, since the Apostle says: 'As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,' Galatians 3:27. Christ cannot be put on without the Spirit, nor can the Spirit be separated from Christ. Mere water without the Holy Spirit can neither purge away sins nor sanctify the man. Wherefore it must be admitted that either the Holy Spirit is there where baptism is, or that baptism is not where the Holy Spirit is not; for baptism cannot be without the Holy Spirit." With these views of Tertullian as to the real nature and efficacy of baptism accord those of Cyril of Jerusalem (1088): "Having been baptized into Christ and having put on Christ, ye become of like form with the Son of God. Therefore having become partakers of the Christ (anointed) you are well called Christoi (anointed ones), and concerning you God says, 'Touch not my anointed ones.' Ye have become Christoi, having received the antitype (the oil in baptism) of the Holy Spirit." And so, too, Basil and Jerome and others. According to the conception of Luther and the Lutheran Church, a sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by God, through which by means of external and visible elements, He bestows and seals His saving grace. Such a divine institution is baptism. It introduces into covenant relationship with God. It is both a sign and a seal of that covenant.

It is a visible sign upon which believers, as Martensen aptly expresses it, "may base the certainty of their election; a certainty which cannot be retained by merely inward convictions in the midst of life's changes, but which must be associated with a visible sign, like the rainbow, to which they can look back in the midst of the storms of life in every time of external or inward need; a bow of hope in the clouds appearing as the rainbow did in the days of Noah." It is more than a sign of the covenant; it is also a seal of the covenant. The covenant God made with Abraham was not binding and complete until the seal was affixed. That seal was circumcision. So St.

Paul, (Romans 4:11) declares, "He received the sign of circumcision, the seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcized." The covenant proposed and sworn to on God's part was ratified and sealed on Abraham's part. Thus it was made effective, and nothing but deliberate rejection or wilful disobedience on the part of the patriarch, or of his descendants, could nullify it. Without a seal, where the law requires one, a contract has no legal, binding force. In the case of the Abrahamic covenant God said concerning him that was not circumcized: "That soul shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken my covenant." (Genesis 17:14). Without the seal, the covenant under the Old Testament dispensation was invalid and inoperative. The new covenant of which the Apostle speaks in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 8:8-12, required a new seal. Circumcision was the seal of the old covenant; baptism of the new. The covenant relationship with the triune God—union with Him in Christ—established by baptism, involves not only surrender, ownership, obedience, but also privileges and blessings of the most exalted character and of infinite value. Martensen speaks of it, "As the sacrament of instituting the true relation to God," whereby children are adopted into the household of faith and made heirs of redeeming grace.

And this brings us to consider more particularly

## II. THE BENEFITS OF BAPTISM.

Our Article teaches that "through baptism is offered the grace of God; and that children are to be baptized who, being offered to God through baptism, are received into His grace." Luther's Small Catechism declares that baptism "worketh forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare."

"The sacraments," says Luthardt,—("The Saving Truths of Christianity," 282-283), "are symbolic actions; but they are pregnant symbols; they possess the thing



which they signify. \* \* \* Baptism signifies purification from sin, not only that we are to cleanse ourselves, but that God will cleanse us. But it does not merely signify this: it gives what it signifies, and lays the foundation of Christian life. Our first, our chief want is the forgiveness of sins. Baptism is the sacrament of the cleansing of the conscience from guilt."

The symbols of our Church and all our confessional writers are found to be in perfect agreement with the plain and repeated declarations of the sacred Scriptures respecting the efficacy of this divine ordinance. These declarations, when interpreted in accordance with the only safe and sound principle that Scripture must be explained by Scripture, are surely sufficiently clear and conclusive, and should carry conviction to all who, with minds free from pre-conceived notions and prejudices, sincerely seek to know the truth. "To the law and the testimony," then, let us go to ascertain just what the benefits and blessings conferred in baptism are.

We begin with the words used in the institution of the rite recorded in Matthew 28: 19-20, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." Divinely commissioned were the apostles to make disciples of all the nations. And this they were to do by baptizing them into the name of the Triune God and teaching them obedience to the divine commands. The Saviour's explicit instruction was to make disciples by baptizing and teaching. Through both sacrament and Word discipleship was to be effected. Baptism then is clearly one of the means through which the Holy Spirit operates in making men disciples, bringing them out of a state of sin into a state of grace. Baptism "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" is no mere empty sign, no meaningless ceremony. The best New Testament exegetes, both ancient and modern, generally agree that the phrase, "baptized into the name of," expresses a real and profound

truth, and not one of mere semblance; expresses very much more than a mark of profession, as some Reformed writers regard baptism. The exact meaning of the Greek preposition *eis* in Acts 19:5, has been given in the Revised Version, "They were baptized *into* the name of the Lord Jesus." The apostle Paul, in Galatians 3:27, makes use of phrases, the full import of which may not be ignored in our study of the deep significance of the sacrament under consideration.—"For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." Commenting on this passage, Olshausen says, "Baptism into Christ is here conceived of in its profoundest idea. The putting on Christ is a description of what happens in the new birth. This expression denotes the most intimate appropriation of Christ. To put on the new man is equal to being renewed. To put on immortality denotes the change of the mortal body into its immortal nature of corporeity. But with whomsoever Christ joins Himself, to *him*, He, the Son of God also communicates the nature of a child of God." And, commenting on the same passage, Ellicott observes, "The meaning of *eis* with βαπτίζω appears two fold; (a) *unto*, object, purpose; and (b) *into*, union and communion with; here and in Romans 6:3, the union is of the most complete and mystical nature." He declares that to baptize "into the name of" implies ever a spiritual and mystical incorporation with him in whose name the sacrament was administered. And that the incorporation thus effected takes place at the time of the administration of the sacrament is certainly implied by the use of the same tense—the aorist—in both clauses, as pointed out by Alford who says, "As many of you as were baptized into Christ, put on Christ at that time. The aorists make the acts identical." And Bengel expresses the same great truth in another form, "Baptized into Christ Jesus he is baptized into a whole Christ and so into his death. It is just as if at that moment Christ suffered, died and were buried for such a man, and such a man suffered, died, were buried with Christ." Thus baptism brings into intimate and blessed relationship with the Divine.



It is an "introduction into the new life that comes from the revelation of God as Father, Son and the Holy Ghost." It establishes an affiliation with the living God in which His grace is offered, and not only offered, but, where no barrier is interposed by a perverse human will, is actually imparted; unless we can believe that God makes offer of that which the soul is incapable of receiving.

Other passages which treat of baptism and its effects are the following:—John 3:5: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Acts 2:38: "Repent ye and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Acts 22:16: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." Romans 6:3: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death?" Col. 2:12: "Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God who raised him from the dead." Titus 3:5: "Not by works done in righteousness which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Of the ark it is written I Peter, 3:20-21: "Wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved through water, which also after a true likeness doth now save us, even baptism."

In face of these declarations of Scripture, repeated, explicit, emphatic, the full force of which is brought out in the American Revision, how can any one refuse to subscribe, *ex animo*, to the ninth article of the Augsburg Confession? What God's Word declares, iterates and reiterates, in language plain and unmistakable, is that in baptism grace is both offered and imparted to every believing soul. "Baptized unto the remission of your sins." "After a true likeness doth now save us, even baptism." Any principle of hermeneutics, whereby baptismal grace can be explained out of the passages quoted, would invalidate the most vital and cherished truths of the Christian religion. If the Scriptures teach anything clearly

they teach that baptism is an actual, and not a mere nominal means of grace; is "a divinely-instituted action, enjoined upon the church until the end of time, in which with the application of water, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, the gospel promise of the forgiveness of sins is offered to everyone baptized, and is most certainly imparted to everyone who believes."

"A Summary of the Christian Faith," p. 325.

It is not imparted to such as do not believe, as Luther affirmed with such emphasis in his Small Catechism, where to the question, "How can water produce such great effects?" he answers, "It is not the water indeed that produces these effects, but the Word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith which relies on the Word of God connected with the water."

Equally explicit and emphatic is the article on "The Use of the Sacraments" in the Augsburg Confession, viz: "They therefore condemn those who teach that the sacraments justify by the outward acts, and do not teach that in the use of the sacraments faith, which believes that sins are forgiven, is required." "Non sacramentum sed fides sacramenti justificat," has been from the first the uniform Lutheran teaching as directly opposed to the *ex opere operato* view of the sacrament maintained by the Romish Church. To quote from the works of Martin Luther (Volume II-228) "Even so it is not baptism that justifies or benefits anyone, but it is faith in the word of promise to which baptism is added. This faith justifies, and fulfills that which baptism signifies. \* \* \* It cannot be, therefore, that there is in the sacraments a power efficacious for justification, or that they are effective signs of grace. All such assertions tend to destroy faith and arise from ignorance of the divine promise. Unless you should call them effective in the sense that they certainly and efficaciously impart grace where faith is unmistakably present; but it is not in this sense that efficacy is now ascribed to them; as witness the fact that they are said to benefit all men, even the godless and unbelieving, pro-



vided they do not oppose a "bar,"—as if such unbelief were not in itself the most obstinate and hostile of all bars to grace. So firmly bent are they on turning the sacrament into a command and faith into a work. For if the sacrament confers grace on me because I receive it, then indeed I obtain grace by virtue of my work and not of faith; I lay hold not on the promise of the sacrament, but on the sign instituted and commanded by God. Do you not see, then, how completely the sacraments have been misunderstood by our sententious theologians? They have taken no account in this discussion on the sacraments of either faith or the promise, but cling only to the sign and the use of the sign, and draw us away from faith to work, from the word to the sign. Thus they have not only carried the sacraments captive, (as I have said), but have completely destroyed them so far as they were able.

\* \* \* To seek the efficacy of the sacrament apart from the promise, and apart from the faith, is to labor in vain and to find damnation. Thus Christ said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." He shows us in this word that faith is so necessary a part of the sacrament that it can save even without the sacrament; for which reason He did not see fit to say, "He that believeth not and is not baptized,—shall be condemned." So vigorously, in his treatise on "The Babylonian Captivity," did Luther oppose the whole pernicious opus operatum sacramental system of the Romish Church, by which she held her members from the cradle to the grave in bondage more cruel than fetters of iron. So earnestly did he contend for the great cardinal principles that faith alone justifies and saves.

Dr. Jacobs, in *Lutheran Cyclopaedia*, has condensed into a single sentence, and in language at once clear, concise and discriminating, what has been the uniform teaching of our Church with regard to the efficacy of baptism. "It is the word that communicates all the grace; and it is faith in the Word of promise accompanying the outward ceremony that alone receives the blessing."

As to the nature of the blessing thus received our ar-



ticle is content simply to declare that "through baptism is offered the grace of God, and that children offered to God through baptism are received into His grace." Because it is not easy to define the precise nature of the grace conferred in baptism, the teaching of the Lutheran Church upon this subject has been frequently misunderstood and misrepresented. When we come to describe the operations of divine grace we find ourselves in the realm of the spiritual and the mysterious. Beyond what God's Word reveals we can affirm nothing positively as to the method or agency by which the Holy Spirit operates in regeneration and sanctification. We must rest content with what has been revealed in the inspired volume. This much we may confidently affirm; the Holy Spirit alone regenerates. Being omnipotent He can regenerate when, where, and how He wills; even as the wind bloweth where it listeth, so is everyone that is born of the Spirit. Hence, He can regenerate through baptism as a means of grace. In view of the Master's own words, "Except one be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God," who will say that regeneration is not ordinarily effected by the Holy Spirit through baptism? In his *Christian Theology*, Vol. II, Dr. Valentine presents a view of baptismal grace that seems borne out by the inspired teachings on this subject:—"Baptism, being distinctly the sacrament of cleansing, exhibits and administers regenerating and sanctifying grace as well as justifying. Through the Holy Spirit it is made a means of the renewal in which the true believer becomes a new creature. \* \* \* Baptism is not a means whose effects are all at once accomplished at the time and in the act of administration, but the establishment of a relation of perpetual spiritual forces and fruitage. \* \* \* The given relation, if not broken, insures the covenanted effect. But often, on the human side, it is wretchedly broken. Since the baptism marks, not as yet the final issue, but rather the point from which the divine grace *begins* to act for the whole Christian life, the human breaking of the covenant—by failure of the pledged



teaching and nurture, or by refusal of the baptized, when grown, to accept Christ—results, as experience sadly proves, in complete failure of the regenerate life. Regeneration is fully provided for, but the actuality can only come in the time and order of the ongoing process,—the personal faith coming only by hearing the Word of the Gospel, and the acceptance of the provided enabling grace and new life. The faith and regeneration are there at first in the *potency* of established means to be realized in the future—*putatively* made the child's by its covenant state." Kahnis, of Leipsig, says: "Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration; but what it imparts is rather the power of regeneration, which is only of efficacy when the faith supposed by baptism is really present. Baptism with regeneration when saving faith is present works the forgiveness of sins, sonship to God, membership in the kingdom of God upon earth, and participation in eternal life. Who these genuine members of the kingdom are God alone knows; so far as man can see all the baptized are included." ("Die Lutherische Dogmatik." Leipsig, 1868, Vol. III, p. 479). Speaking of what he calls the "mystery of baptism," Martensen in his "Christian Dogmatics," page 427, writes: "Regeneration is by no means concluded with baptism; but the foundation of it is therein laid; and it is not therefore baptism alone which saves, but baptism and faith. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Regeneration is completed only when the grace of baptism appears in power in *personal* regeneration. Just as the Church in its beginning was established partly by an act of Christ who laid the foundation, and gave it a beginning *essentially* in his apostles; and partly by an act of the Holy Spirit, who established the Church *actually* on the day of Pentecost—glorifying Christ in and through his Apostles—so, in the case of the individual, regeneration depends partly upon the act of Christ in baptism, laying the foundations of His Church and Kingdom in the soul, in virtue of which regeneration becomes a germinal possibility; and partly upon the actual communication of the Holy Ghost. We may, there-



fore, say that the person baptized is not actually regenerate until his Pentecost is fully come, until the Spirit establishes within him the new consciousness and makes the grace of baptism manifest. These two acts, which are but two sides of one and the same gracious work—the objective and the subjective, the essential and the personal aspects of the beginning of the new life—may take place simultaneously in the baptism of such as are of riper years. But in the case of baptism in the less distinct and milder form of it, in the baptism of children, the two are separated from one another as to time, and here what is *conditional* in the grace of baptism is clearly seen, for personal regeneration cannot be accomplished without a free effort upon the part of the person himself.”

The later dogmaticians of the Lutheran Church disclaim and utterly repudiate as unscriptural the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as commonly understood. It is a thoroughly gross conception of this sacrament, and not far removed from the Romish opus operatum view. Dr. C. P. Krauth in “Conservative Reformation,” p. 559, declares: “The assumption that what the Church says of baptism she affirms of mere water baptism rests on a fundamental misapprehension.” After quoting from Gerhard to the effect, “That some adults, by actual impenitence, hypocrisy and obstinacy, deprive themselves of the salutary efficacy of baptism we freely admit.” Dr. Krauth goes on to say, “Just as clear as they are in their judgment that baptism is not necessarily followed by regeneration are our Church and her great divines in the judgment that regeneration is not necessarily preceded by baptism or attended by it,” and further on adds, “The charge against our Church of teaching baptismal regeneration, as those who make the charge define it, is, as we have seen, utterly ungrounded. It is not true in its general statement, nor in its details; it is utterly without warrant in the whole, or in a single particular.” Dr. Brown, in his lectures to his students in this Seminary, presented the Lutheran view of baptism, “as one of the means, when rightly used, whereby the Holy Ghost is



given and regeneration effected," and declared that "Baptismal regeneration, in the vulgar sense, is directly opposed to the Lutheran view as it is to the Word of God. The Bible knows nothing of any charm or magical power in baptism as the simple application of water to wash away sin. The question and answer of Paul,—Romans 3:1-2,—in reference to circumcision, are very pertinent to this subject, and may serve to illustrate the value of baptism."

In our Church's confessions and catechisms, efficacy is ascribed to baptism not as an *opus operatum*, but as a sacrament having in it the Word of God. The whole efficacy is ascribed to the Word and to faith in that Word. Without this, according to Luther, baptism is "a fruitless sign."

Since faith is essential to the efficacy of the sacrament, do children who die in infancy die unregenerate and unsaved? Or are they capable of exercising faith and of thus meeting the condition of salvation? What is the use of baptizing little children, the opponents of infant baptism ask, seeing that they cannot believe? "Such learning," says Prof. Loy, in his *Exposition of the Augsburg Confession*, p. 649, "has not been learned in the school of Christ. Even supposing that God could not work faith in the soul of a babe, would not its induction into covenant relations with its Lord through baptismal grace be of some use in its forlorn condition, and would not the impartation of spiritual gifts from the fulness of Christ be of some value to the child that is dead in sin, even if it were so that it is as yet incompetent to utilize these gifts? It is surely something, to be made an heir of great treasure even if for the present it be impossible to realize the benefit. In numerous cases the adult does not appropriate the gift of grace by believing at the time of his baptism, and yet Anabaptists do not deem it necessary to baptize such a person again when he later believes. The promise and the covenant stand sure for all time, and the benefit is realized when we believe, though it be long after the means by which the grace is conveyed was first em-

ployed. But it is not true that children cannot believe. God can work faith in them with less hindrance than in adults whose developed reason is usually an obstacle which is not found in babes."

Upon the subject of infant faith our Lutheran dogmatists are not agreed. But all are agreed that such faith is not absolutely essential to the efficacy of baptism, nor a prerequisite to its valid administration. Those who claim that infants are capable of exercising faith are usually careful to qualify that claim by modifications of it that fall short of the Scriptural and even confessional definition of faith, as including the positive psychological elements—"knowledge, assent and confidence,"—as its essential constituents. Some speak of it as only a "*passive susceptibility* to grace," an "unconscious faith," or a "receptive faith." Certain Calvinistic divines hold to a view of infant faith which approximates the Lutheran view, as Dr. Krauth has pointed out. Calvin acknowledges "a seed of faith in infants." Ursinus says they have an "inclinary faith or inclination to faith." Voetius says "there is in them a root, faculty, supernatural principle, seed, or nursery, from whence in its own time faith rises up." But are we justified in calling *that* faith which is without a single element which faith essentially includes? If it includes knowledge, assent and trust, as dogmatic theology is so careful to affirm—when it would guard the conception of saving faith—is it not at least confusing and misleading that an unconscious babe when presented for baptism should be credited with faith when as yet it is incapable of knowledge, assent or trust? Says Gottfried Thomasius, whom Kurtz's Church History classes among the eminent confessional Lutheran theologians, (Vol. II, p. 381, III Ed.), "Faith, at least in the sense and according to the Scriptural way of speaking, is a *conscious* condition—which has personal confiding trust (*fiducia*, *apprehensio fiducialis*) as its real kernel, and contrition as its necessary presupposition. If we abstract these factors, as in the case of children we must, there is then lacking exactly that which character-



izes the essence of faith. In addition, faith has its *causa efficiens* in the Word, but the Word is always imparted to the human spirit through 'hearing.' \* \* \* This hearing is of course a conscious reception, and such reception does not yet take place in children in the act of baptism. Hence that which the Holy Spirit works in them we cannot indeed name "faith." According to our view there is no need in children of faith as an antecedent condition for the blessing of baptism,—for our dogmaticians regard it as antecedent, not in time but in order. Much rather, we hold, does the *relation* precede, which God's gracious act establishes, and then follows the condition of faith which is first rendered possible through the relation. \* \* \* But the conscious appropriation follows through personal faith which is created by the Word which comes after. If this remains away from the baptized child, then it never comes to that, in its case, which the Biblical phraseology designates as faith.\* \* \* On the contrary I lay weight on this that the child is implanted in the organism of the congregation, because in it not merely the security but the medium is given whereby the gift of baptism works itself out into personal faith."

It does not follow that infant baptism is not valid because infants wholly lack, as yet, the mental qualifications for accepting or rejecting the grace of the new life—because they do not exist mentally, their rational nature being yet undeveloped. If adult baptism, without personal faith, is valid because the Holy Spirit changes the relation of its subjects, making it possible for them to appropriate the baptismal grace in their subsequent submission to the terms of the gospel in full, and if the validity of baptism cannot depend upon the *age* of its subjects any more than it depends on their faith, it follows that infant baptism is equally valid even where faith is as yet lacking. This conclusion is fully sustained by analogy from the Old Testament practice of infant consecration. Jewish male children could exercise no personal agency at their formal introduction into the kingdom of heaven at the age of eight days, but their circumcision

was none the less valid for all that. Under the New Testament dispensation little children are introduced into the kingdom of heaven by baptism because there is no hindrance to the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit. The administration of adult baptism, on the other hand, requires the *removal* of a hindrance for its effectiveness. The natural will, which is hostile to God, and resists His grace, must be subdued in repentance as a preliminary to the administration of the ordinance. In infant baptism moral obstruction to baptismal grace is impossible, because the infant has not the mental qualification for rejecting the offered grace.

To maintain that an unconscious infant, born in sin, knowing nothing of the Gospel, and that cannot by its own reason or strength believe in Christ, is in and by the act of baptism endowed with saving faith, and then and there regenerated, is to ascribe to the sacrament the magical opus operatum, which our Lutheran theologians have so vigorously repudiated and condemned as one of the chief abominations of the Romish Church. The truth on this subject is of the most vital practical importance, as Dr. Valentine in his article on Infant Faith (LUTH. QUAR. Jan. 1899) has strongly stated it. "To imagine the baptized child at once possessed of faith and spiritually regenerated, becomes the occasion of parental neglect in the necessary training in the truth as it is in Jesus, which is the Spirit's instrument for a living faith and new life. One of the divinest blessings in the sacrament is the "nurture and admonition in the Lord," so solemnly covenanted and sealed. Through this the child is to come to know the Word, which brings to both faith and regeneration. But the notion taught and credited that both faith and regeneration have been accomplished in baptism itself, annuls the sense of parental responsibility for the results. *The work has been done!* \* \* \* It is beyond all question true, that always and everywhere the notion that not only is the foundation for personal faith and regeneration laid in infant baptism, but that these effects are then and there accomplished, becomes a blighting relaxation to the pa-



rental care and diligence for instruction and nurture in the Word as the divinely-ordained means for carrying the baptismal grace into its covenanted realizations."

### III. THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM.

"Of Baptism they teach that it is necessary to salvation." In so saying, our article simply affirms what Christ Himself expressly taught when He said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." It has pleased Him to lay down these two conditions of salvation. What God hath joined together in a covenanted blessing let no man put asunder. Baptism is necessary to salvation, because the Word of God requires it. Whatever precepts the Master has given must be obeyed. Obedience to the divine commands is always obligatory. But while God binds us to observe the sacrament He instituted as a means through which grace is offered, He does not bind Himself to this means for conveying grace. Our article does not affirm that baptism is *essential* to salvation. That which is essential is absolutely indispensable. "It is essential to our redemption," as Dr. Krauth well observes, "that Christ should die for us." Without the shedding of blood is no remission,—can be no remission. Salvation was impossible apart from the sacrifice on Calvary. It is "necessary" that we should hear the gospel, for it is the power of God unto salvation. But infants who cannot hear the gospel, so as to understand it, are yet saved.

The Lutheran Church teaches that "The necessity of baptism is not absolute, but ordinary." (Gerhard IX, 383). "Our theologians make this distinction," says Dr. Loy, "because the teachings of God's Word require Christians to make it, in order not to push such necessity to an extreme that would conflict with the statements of the Gospel in other respects and deprive them of the comfort which it gives in its totality. As men may be lost though they are baptized, so men may be saved though they are not baptized. But they are not lost by reason of their

baptism, and they are not saved by reason of their lacking it. According to Mark 16:16, only he that believeth not shall be condemned. Bernard has stated the Lutheran view in regard to the necessity of baptism; "Non defectus, sed contemptus, sacramenti damnat."

No theologian adhered more rigidly to our confessional theology than Dr. Hutter, of Wittenberg University. To the question, "Is Baptism necessary to salvation?" he answers in his "Compend of Lutheran Theology"; "It is: and that because of God's command. For whatever God has instituted and commanded is to be done, is precious, useful, and necessary, though as to its outward form it be viler than a straw."

In certain early editions of the Augsburg Confession—Melancthon added to the first clause of the ninth Article the words: "Of baptism they teach that it is necessary to salvation '*as a ceremony instituted of Christ.*'" Who could refuse to subscribe to such teaching? "Faith is absolutely essential to salvation; baptism *ordinarily* essential only." (Cons. Ref., p. 441).

The thief on the cross died without being baptized. The Saviour Himself settled the question of his future destiny when He said "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." May we not believe that children who die in infancy are saved even though unbaptized? But if, as alleged, faith is absolutely essential to salvation, what of children who die in early years before they can know of Him whom to know is life eternal? There are good and valid reasons for holding that all children dying in infancy are saved. Their salvation might be argued from the mercy of God. To suppose that he would visit eternal death upon children without giving them an opportunity to escape, while He has provided life and salvation for adults, would be to reflect infinite dishonor upon His moral perfections. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" It is true they are born in sin, and hence cannot be saved by virtue of their native innocence. If saved, it must be alone through the death and mediation of Christ.



Did not the Saviour declare that faith is necessary to salvation? Did He not say, "He that believeth not shall be damned?" True. But if faith, the instrument of salvation, be the free gift of God to all believing adults, may we not fairly presume that in the case of infants who cannot receive the gift, because they have no ability to appreciate its nature or its object, and no ability to exercise saving faith, God would bestow salvation without it? But upon stronger ground than mere probability do we rest our belief that those dying in infancy are saved. It is upon the whole genius, spirit, and object of the great redemption. The atonement of Christ was intended to benefit the whole human race; but if infants perish, in that far it falls short of its design. Would it be consistent with either the justice or love of God to suppose that in the great plan of redemption no provision would be made to meet the wants of those dying in early years? Who will not rather believe that even as, without sharing in the personal transgression of the first natural head of our race, without sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression, they became involved in death, even so, though not believing—that opportunity not being offered them—they will share in the benefit of that life which the second, the Spiritual Head of our race has brought and offers freely to all? It is distinctly affirmed of Christ Jesus that "by the grace of God He should taste of death for every man." Heb. 2:9. In Romans 5:18, the saving benefits of the atonement are declared to be co-extensive with the blighting effects of the fall. "So then, as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation, even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life." In the same way in which sin has been transmitted from the first Adam to all his posterity, so righteousness is transferred from the second Adam to all mankind, provided nothing interferes to arrest the transfer; this is the one, single exception. The redemption wrought out on Calvary covers the need of not a part only, but of the whole world. It would reach and save every soul if there

were no barrier raised to shut out this salvation. In the case of adults there is often an interposing obstruction,—a wilful and deliberate rejection of the Gospel forms a fatal barrier. Every man is a free moral agent. He can, if he will, reject God's offered grace. In the case of infants there is, and so far as we know, can be no such barrier,—no wilful rejection of the great salvation. Shall they be condemned for not believing on the Son of God? "How shall they believe in Him whom they have not heard?"

If the atonement was designed to benefit the whole race, then children—all children—must in some way be made partakers of it. Since they are incapable of exercising faith, may we not conclude that a gracious and righteous God will provide some way whereby they shall share in the benefits of His redemptive work? Infants, dying without believing or being baptized, are surely not beyond the reach of God's sovereign and omnipotent grace. At the same time it remains true, as our Article affirms, that baptism is necessary to salvation. It is necessary because the Word of God requires it, and it is necessary because through baptism is offered the grace of God. It is, however, not the only means which our Lord has ordained for conveying his grace unto salvation: "He has not exhausted His mercy or His power in the institution of this means, and may in His infinite love resort even to extraordinary ways of bringing sinners to the great salvation provided for all men in Christ." ("The Augsburg Confession," p. 624, Dr. Loy). In condemning the Anabaptists, who "say that children are saved without baptism," the Lutheran Church is only emphasizing the indispensable need of regeneration, which great and saving change, wrought by the Holy Spirit, is provided for in baptism which "establishes the covenant relations and forces from which the actual renewal, and the whole Christian life, proceeds according to the means and order of grace."

The necessity of baptism then is not absolute but ordinary. "Not the absence, but the contempt, of the sacrament condemns"—is the uniform teaching of all Luth-



eran dogmaticians, and which is in harmony with the revelation of God as a just and righteous Being. In reference to children who are unbaptized Luther says, "The holy and merciful God will think kindly of them." What He will do with them He has revealed to no one, that baptism may not be despised, but has reserved it to His own mercy. God does wrong to no man."

#### IV. THE PROPER SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

Our Article declares, "Children are to be baptized." It condemns the Anabaptists "who allow not the baptism of children,"—maintaining that only believers should be baptized, and only on the profession of their personal faith in Christ. Infants can neither repent nor believe, and hence Baptists oppose infant baptism. That children, one or both of whose parents are professing Christians, are proper subjects for baptism has been and is the teaching of by far the major portion of the Christian Church. In justification of their belief and practice pedobaptists submit the following consideration:

1. The teaching of Christ in reference to little children. He claimed them as belonging to Him and to His kingdom. "To such belongeth the kingdom of Heaven" was His reply to His own disciples, who rebuked those who brought their little ones to Him, that He should lay His hands on them and pray. If to children belongs the kingdom of God, begun on earth and perfected in glory, why refuse to administer to them the rite of initiation into that kingdom? "It is not the will of your father which is in Heaven that one of these little ones perish," said Jesus. It must therefore be His will that they meet the conditions through which they are delivered from the state of sin in which they are born. Of these conditions baptism is one, and the only one possible for fulfillment in their case. In the great commission to disciple all nations, the apostles were directed to baptize and teach. Infants are part of a nation. Of them disciples are to be made—first by being baptized, and later by being

taught to observe all things that are commanded. Unless excluded from baptism by some explicit command, the duty of baptizing children is clear. As well exclude women from the Lord's Supper because they are not specifically mentioned in the institution of that sacrament. "Feed my lambs" was the risen Saviour's charge to Peter. The Good Shepherd here claims the lambs as His. They belong to His flock. Why, then, refuse them admission to the fold by refusing them the only initiatory rite?

2. The practice of the apostles has been urged in support of infant baptism. Four "household baptisms," in contradistinction from "believers' baptisms," are mentioned as follows:—that of Lydia (Acts 16:15); that of the Philippian jailer (Acts 16:32-33); that of Crispus (Acts 18:8); that of Stephanus (I Cor. 1:16). Is it not a reasonable inference that there were children, possibly infants, in these households? In I Cor. 7:14, St. Paul declares that children of mixed marriages, either father or mother a believer, are "sanctified,"—"now are they holy,"—not "sanctified" or "holy" in the sense of moral purity, but set apart in a holy relationship or covenant, and hence entitled to the same covenant seal as belongs to the believing parent.

3. The early Church recognized infants as proper subjects of baptism. At the time of Augustine, born A. D. 353, infant baptism prevailed as the universal practice. It has prevailed ever since, except among the Baptists whose origin as an ecclesiastical body may be traced to the sixteenth century. Their first Confession of Faith was not adopted until 1644. Going back in the history of the Church to the time of Cyprian, born about A. D. 200, we find him adhering to the teaching of the earlier fathers, that the baptism of infants need not be delayed till they were eight days old. At the Council of Carthage A. D. 252, he presents the decision which was unanimous on this subject, i. e., that infants might be baptized at any age without waiting until the eighth day, as was then usual on the analogy of circumcision, but that infants should be baptized within two or three days of birth.



The learned Origen, born, A. D. 185, writes, (Hom. in Levit. chap. 12) : "According to the usage of the Church, baptism is given even to infants." His father and grandfather were Christians, and he himself was baptized in infancy. Tertullian, whose disciple and admirer Cyprian was, born A. D. 160, objects, indeed, to infant baptism, but his objections show its prevalence at the time. He did not question its scriptural or apostolic authority, but argued only against its propriety. "Why," he asks, "does the age of innocence hasten to the remission of sins?" (de Bapt. 18). He wishes baptism delayed not only in the case of infants, but also in the case of others, whom he thereupon mentions,—the unmarried in particular. The danger of sin after baptism was so great that it should not be incurred, since, as was then commonly taught, grave post-baptismal sin could only once be forgiven. The fear of falling into grave sin after baptism was a powerful motive for delay.

Irenaeus, who was born about A. D. 115, and died in the year 190, wrote, "He came to save all by means of Himself, all, I say, who through Him are born again to God, infants and children and boys and youths and old men."

Justin Martyr, the first Christian apologist whose works have come down to us, who suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius A. D. 165, and who was born about A. D. 89, sometime before the death of the apostle John, wrote, "Many, both men and women, 60 or 70 years old, remain who from their infancy were made disciples of Christ."

But not alone upon these testimonies of the early Church Fathers, conclusive as they are, nor upon the practice of the apostles, nor yet upon the teaching of Christ Himself, do we rest our argument in favor of infant baptism.

4. The validity of infant baptism rests moreover upon the unquestionable fact that God established infant membership in His Church on the basis of the parental relation, and sealed it by a sacramental rite. Now the

Church is one and the covenant is the same under both the Old and the New Testament dispensations. To Abraham God said, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee, throughout their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." Gen. 17:7. "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." Gal. 3:29. In this covenant, which is one and the same under different dispensations, from Abraham to the end of the world, children were included and received the sign and seal of their participation. Through circumcision Abraham's seed came under formal covenant as God's people, were regarded and treated as belonging to the Jewish Church, entitled to all its privileges and blessings. In the change of the seals of the covenant there is no mention in the New Testament of any change in the subjects. Baptism has been substituted for circumcision as the initiatory rite and seal of visible Church membership. As the Lord's Supper has taken the place of the Passover, so has baptism come in the stead of circumcision. Now, if children were thus once included by covenant in the Church by express divine command, they cannot be excluded without the same express warrant. No such warrant has ever been pretended, nor is there in the New Testament a hint of any such change, but the very contrary is directly and indirectly implied. Acts 2:39, "For to you is the promise and to your children." "How the Jews who had always been accustomed to regard their children as included in the Church would have regarded so radical a change, we can readily imagine, and yet with all the prejudice and antipathy of the Jews to the introduction of Christianity as changing the laws and customs under which they had lived, this objection is never so much as hinted at. The conclusion is inevitable. The gospel made no such change in the relation of children to the Church. If children are not any longer to be regarded as entitled to membership in the Church of God those who would exclude them must produce the warrant for their exclusion, or we shall continue to claim their



covenant rights granted by God Himself." Dr. J. A. Brown.

It is thus that Dr. Krauth states it as "the argument *a fortiori*: If in the Old Testament, comparatively restricted as its range was, infants were embraced in the covenant, much more in the New Testament broader and more gracious than the Old as it is, would they be embraced. But infants are embraced in the Old; much more then in the New." If children, under the former dispensation were admitted into covenant relationship with God by circumcision, and were capable of enjoying the blessings of the covenant, why shall they not enjoy these same blessings now that Christ has come? Now that our race is redeemed, and the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ shines out from Calvary all over the earth in its moral darkness, must the poor little children, born in sin and under condemnation, be excluded from the benefits of the great redemption secured at such infinite cost and intended for the whole human family? The Christian covenant and the Christian Church are but the expansion and development of the Jewish. Infant membership obtained in the latter. Who shall say it has no place in the former? Christ has not said it, neither His apostles; shall we? God forbid. We find the principle of family representation fundamental in the Church's charter, standing out with peculiar prominence on almost the first page of sacred history. God's covenant with Noah was established on this principle: "I establish my covenant with you and *with your seed after you.*" Gen. 9:9. "Come thou *and all thy house* into the Ark, for thee have I seen righteous." For the sake of Noah's righteousness the children, including the scoffing Ham, are sheltered from the impending doom and safe from the desolations when the dove could find no green leaf, nor rest for the soles of her feet. While the blessings of salvation are not conferred upon children regardless of personal faith and personal character, there is in Scripture a clear recognition of the divinely announced principle of family representation, the children

born in the covenant share in its privileges and blessings as their birthright. As God's covenant with Noah, and later with Abraham, was all-inclusive, so with His covenant since. If infants were admitted to covenant relations by circumcision without personal faith, why may they not be admitted to such relations by baptism without personal faith?

The opponents of infant baptism claim that children become the subjects of divine grace without its appointed means, and, dying in infancy, are somehow regenerated—and hence made meet for the kingdom of God, but that they cannot, and do not, in the use of these means become the subjects of divine grace. If without the water of baptism they can be born again of the Spirit, why may they not be born of water and of the Spirit, since in both cases alike personal faith is impossible? Our Baptist friends deny baptism to infants because the Lord makes the ordinance depend on the faith of its subject, while, with a strange and reckless inconsistency, they claim that children dying in infancy are regenerated and sanctified, notwithstanding the Lord makes the grace depend on the faith of its subject. If they may not be baptized without personal faith, how can they, dying in early years, be born again and enter into the kingdom of God without such faith? Baptists obviously set no special value on consistency as a jewel.

#### V. THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

The Lutheran reformers regarded the manner of administering baptism as a matter of such indifference that they made no reference to it in the Article now under discussion. Their failure to treat of the mode of baptism is in harmony with the fundamental principle in Lutheran theology—that of insisting only on things essential. Outward forms are not of vital concern. In instituting the sacraments, as well as in the outward organization of the Church, the Master left no specific instructions as to forms of administration. While decrying the use of



rituals and prescribed forms of worship as opposed to "the simplicity of the gospel of Christ," the different branches of the Baptist Church and the Greek Catholic Church make so much of the quantity of water used in baptism and of the manner of applying it, that the total immersion of the body is, they insist, absolutely essential to the validity of the ordinance and is positively demanded by our Lord; that the application of water in any other way whatsoever is no baptism. To such lengths is it possible to go when men lay stress upon externalities rather than the Word of promise which is the chief thing in the sacrament. As well maintain that the outward posture assumed in partaking of the Lord's Supper is essential,—that nothing short of reclining at the table will suffice, as insist that nothing short of the complete submergence of the body in water constitutes valid baptism.

That immersion was a mode of baptism in the early Church is undisputed. That it was the only mode is unproved. The unknown author of the *Didache*—"The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles"—the earliest of the uninspired writings of the Christian Church—gives this as one of the interesting directions as to the form to be followed in administering baptism, in Chap. VII:—"If thou hast neither, (neither running nor standing, neither cold nor warm water in sufficient quantity for immersion) pour water on the head three times into the name of Father and Son and Holy Ghost." Here, then, we have the oldest extant testimony for the validity of baptizing by pouring, or aspersion. The *Didache* claims no apostolic authority. It is simply the summary of what the author learned either from personal instruction, or oral tradition, to be the teaching of the apostles, and what he honestly believed himself. "It is," says Dr. Schaff, "anonymous, but not pseudonymous: post-apostolic but not pseudo-apostolic. It takes its place among the genuine documents of the apostolic fathers so-called—Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, Hermas. These writings fill the gap between the apostles and the Church Fathers from the close of the first to the middle of

the second century; just as the apocrypha of the Old Testament fill the gap between Malachi and John the Baptist."

We have, therefore, the right to infer that while St. John, the last of the apostles, was still living, there was no rigid uniformity in regard to the *mode* of baptism, and no scruple about the validity of a form other than immersion.

Dr. Valentine, in *Christian Theology*, Vol. II, p. 313 sq., puts the matter in a way that leaves little or no room for further controversy. "The proper mode of the ordinance is best perceived and settled in the light of the general tenor of the Biblical acts of purification, which New Testament baptism sums up. The facts are impressively significant. All through the Old Testament the purifying rites fell prevailing, if not entirely, under the forms of pouring and sprinkling. \* \* \* When we pass to the New Testament facts we find these to accord best with the modes thus established in all the purifying and consecratory rites and symbols in the Old Testament order. (1) The Baptism of John, though not identical with Christian baptism, may be noted as suggestive of baptismal mode. Was it by immersion, as sometimes asserted? In the absence of positive historical affirmation, it is exceedingly improbable. For immersion would have violated all the types referring to the new dispensation which John announced, and have left the act without normal significance. \* \* \* (2) When we add the baptism of Christ by the Baptist, the idea of immersion is further precluded. This baptism marks the presentation of Jesus to the public, marks His open assumption of His Messianic offices, as He was about to enter upon His ministry. In the light of Jewish order, this rite providentially became His self-chosen consecration to His offices of Priest and King. Such consecration was always by *sprinkling* and *pouring*—never by immersion. The use of the latter would have left it a strange anomaly, violative of Jewish symbolism. \* \* \* (3) Very pertinent in this connection is the narrative of the Baptism by the



Holy Spirit, on Pentecost. There is no immersion there. When God baptizes His people, with great effectual Baptism, it is by "pouring out" of His Spirit. Is it to be supposed that God has meant that the Church shall make the form of water baptism violate the form of divine Baptism? (4) All the cases of Baptism by the Apostles are best explained as by this mode, as family baptisms at home or in prison, of the Eunuch, Cornelius, etc., where the water or conditions for immersion are hardly conceivable."

As the controversy concerning the mode of baptism so largely turns upon the meaning of the original word βαπτίζω, we may not conclude this discussion without some reference to the several definitions given it by the lexicographers and to its use in the Scriptures and in classic literature.

The Baptist Confession of Faith declares, "Baptizing is dipping, and dipping is Baptizing." In his scholarly and exhaustive work on Baptism, covering four volumes, Dr. J. W. Dale makes answer to this statement, and has also effectually disposed of the amazing claim of Dr. Alexander Carson, a leading Baptist authority, who, in contending for immersion on philological grounds, insists that βαπτίζω means "to dip and nothing but dip, through all Greek literature."

By numerous citations from the Greek classics Dr. Dale has conclusively demonstrated that the word βαπτίζω does not in all cases mean to *dip* or *plunge*, that it is altogether impossible to attribute to the word in question any such meaning in a multitude of cases. If it invariably means to *dip*, or *plunge* into, then, according to one classical author—Conon—(Narrat. L.) we must accept the following as a correct translation of οίνω δέ πολλῳ Ἀλεξάνδρον βαπτισασα: "having immersed Alexander in wine," with Dr. Carson's interpretation—"that is, having made him drunk with wine." To "dip" anyone in wine, for the purpose of representing a state of drunkenness, is a figure of speech as amazing as it is amusing, yet Dr. Carson insists that βαπτίζω means "to dip, and nothing but dip, through

all Greek literature"; and that the whole person, in baptism, must go within the element. Consequently Alexander must go, head and ears, within the wine, and be submerged in it long enough to imbibe its intoxicating qualities. How long this would take Dr. Carson does not presume to say, but may we not venture the guess that before a man thus submerged would get drunk he would be drowned?

If βαπτίζω means to dip and nothing else, then in the phrase εβαπτετο δ' αἵματι λίμνε, from Aesop, attributed to Homer, we have "the lake was dipped in blood," in explanation of which Dr. Dale, an eminent Baptist writer says, "The lake is represented, by hyperbole, as dipped in blood." Dr. Carson contradicts his brother in the faith by replying after this positive, if not impatient, fashion: "Never was there such a figure. The lake is not said to be dipped, or poured, or sprinkled, but dyed with blood." "The lake dyed by blood."—If this translation, (to which no pedo-baptist will object) is not in harmony with Baptist teaching, it is at least in harmony with the rules of rhetoric and with good sense, for even the most vivid imagination finds it difficult to fancy a lake taken up and plunged into a red sea of blood.

The meaning of the word βαπτίζω as determined by the usage of classical Greek writers, and not a few standard lexicographers, ought, if any regard is to be paid to recognized scholarship or to philological argument, to end the wearisome and unwarranted controversy as to the mode of baptism. The classic use of the word does not require it to mean immersion. It may mean to *bathe*, to *pour upon*, to *sprinkle*. Plato, in one of his dialogues, speaks of being "baptized with wine." Aristophanes uses it, "shaved his face and baptized it with ashes." Josephus says, "they baptized the city with violence."

In the Septuagint the word is not often found. In Daniel 4:33 it is said the body of Nebuchadnezzar "was wet (baptized) with the dew of heaven." Here the idea of dipping is absolutely precluded. Leviticus, 14:6, "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood



and the hyssop, and shall dip (βαπτεί) them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water." All these things could not be immersed in the blood of a bird. In the Apocryphal Book of Judith we read, "She baptized herself in the camp at the spring of water." Even if the spring was such an extraordinary one as to allow of her being totally immersed in it, a camp filled with Assyrian soldiers does not seem an appropriate bathing place for a young woman of distinction, even at night.

In the New Testament the word βαπτίζω occurs seventy-six times. In some of these it cannot mean immersion.

In Mark 1:4, we read, "John was baptizing in the wilderness." If "baptizing in the Jordan" means immersion in the waters of the Jordan, then baptizing in the wilderness must mean baptizing in the desert or ground. Dr. Hodge declares, "So far, therefore as the New Testament is concerned, there is not a single case where baptism necessarily implies immersion; there are many cases in which that meaning is entirely inadmissible, and many more in which it is in the highest degree improbable." "It is not denied that βαπτίζειν means to immerse, or that it is frequently so used by the Fathers, as by the classic authors; it is not denied that the Christian rite was often administered after the apostolic age by immersion; it is not even denied that during certain periods of the history of the Church, and in certain regions, immersion was the common method in which baptism was administered. But it is denied that immersion is essential to baptism; that it was the common method in the Apostolic churches; that it was at any time, or in any part of the Church, the exclusive method; and more especially is it denied that immersion is now and everywhere obligatory or necessary to the integrity of Christian Baptism." Baptism by either affusion or sprinkling is, we claim, in harmony with Scripture representations and the design of the ordinance.

*Hazleton, Pa.*

## ARTICLE II.

THE MARKS OF LUTHERANISM: THE RIGHT  
PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL AND THE  
RIGHT ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
SACRAMENTS.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. CLUTZ, D.D.

This quadricentennial year is a time for Lutherans to take stock of their possessions. Among these is to be reckoned the entire movement which had its inception on October 31st, 1517, when Luther nailed his immortal Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg, and all that was connected with the movement. One of the most important events of the Reformation was the presentation of the Augsburg Confession before the Diet of Augsburg June 25th, 1530. This statement of the views held and taught by Luther and his followers had been prepared in response to a command of the Emperor that they make answer to the charges of heresy brought against them by the representatives of the Pope.

In the Seventh Article of the Confession the Reformers define the Church as "the congregation of the saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments are rightly administered." The German first edition differs from this slightly: "The Church is the assembly of all believers in which the Gospel is purely preached, and the sacraments are administered according to the Gospel." In some respects this definition is to be preferred, though of course the meaning is substantially the same in both. The subject at the head of this Article is suggested by this definition of the Church. It is not the intention to discuss it theologically or doctrinally, but entirely from the practical point of view.

I. *The right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments are the distinctive marks of the Lutheran Church.*

This was pre-eminently true at the time of the Re-



formation, and as between the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics. For some centuries before the Reformation the right, or pure preaching of the Gospel had been almost unknown in the Church. Indeed, for a long time there had been very little preaching of any kind. The altar had almost entirely supplanted the pulpit. The sacrifice of the Mass was the chief thing in public worship. What little preaching there still remained was largely in praise of the saints. It was made up, for the most part, of extravagant and often very foolish eulogies of their piety, or of equally extravagant and foolish stories of their alleged miracles. The Virgin Mary was referred to more frequently than her son Jesus Christ. Indeed, she was presented as the Saviour of sinners rather than He, and it was through her rather than through Him that men were to approach the Father and win His favor and blessing. Repentance of sin and justification by faith in the atonement of Calvary, those two most vital and fundamental truths of the Gospel, were seldom heard of. Men were taught that they were to be saved by works of righteousness, or deeds of penance, or by the mechanical use of the sacraments, or by purchasing a share in the treasures of grace accumulated by the Church from the works of supererogation performed by the saints, and controlled and portioned out to whom he would by the Holy Father, the Pope.

It is true that the situation was not so bad in Germany as it was in Italy and especially in Rome. But that it was bad enough in Germany is evident from what Luther says, in his introduction to his catechisms, concerning the ignorance of evangelical truth and life which he discovered during the visitation of the Saxon churches in 1527 and 1528. Luther himself, however, had been sounding a better note in his preaching and teaching at Wittenberg even before his break with Rome. In his lectures on the Psalms, and on Romans, and Galatians, and Hebrews, he had been gradually approaching a truly evangelical conception of the way of salvation and of a true Christian experience and life. Hence, when, in the Summer and

Autumn of 1517, John Tetzel drew near to Wittenberg with his scandalous sale of indulgences in which there was guaranteed to all who paid the schedule price a full and complete pardon from the Pope himself, not only for sins already committed by either the living or the dead, but also for sins planned for the future, Luther was ready to meet him not only by nailing his famous Ninety-five Theses to the church door, but also by thundering fierce denunciations against him from the pulpit within the church.

From that time on Luther and those who sympathized with him in his battle for the purification of the Church began to preach the pure Gospel with ever growing clearness, and with ever increasing force and acceptance among the people. The pulpit thus became a new power and the chief agency in the spread of the Reformation. Luther himself preached almost constantly, often daily during the week and not seldom three or four times on the Lord's day. Many of the other Reformers did the same. Many of these sermons, especially Luther's, were printed and scattered broadcast. Thus the press became, as it has ever remained, a most important ally of the pulpit in the work of making known the truth. But the right preaching of the Gospel was the most vital element in the battle with error and with spiritual darkness and ignorance.

It is not strange, therefore, that Luther laid so great stress on the preaching of the word. He regarded preaching as more important than the public reading of the Scriptures. He says: "The devil does not mind the written word, but he is put to flight whenever it is preached aloud." He regarded the sermon the chief thing in public worship. He declared that it would be better not to assemble at all for worship if the Gospel was not preached. Neither is it strange that when he and his fellow Reformers came to formulate their confession of faith they made the right preaching of the Gospel one of the distinguishing marks of the true Evangelical Church.



The preaching of a pure Gospel has always been a distinctive mark of the Lutheran Church throughout its history. It is still so to-day. In saying this it is of course not meant that the Lutheran Church is the only one of the great family of the Protestant Churches that preaches the Gospel in its purity. That would be a very narrow and presumptuous position to take, and it would not be warranted by the facts. Neither is the claim made that all Lutheran preachers have always preached the pure Gospel or that all Lutheran preachers are doing so to-day. This, alas, would not be true either. What is meant is that in her confessional statements and in her official deliverances, in her preparation of men for the ministry in her schools, and in all her accredited and authoritative literature, the Lutheran Church has consistently stressed the preaching of the pure Gospel more strongly than any other Church. The claim is also made that the Lutheran ministry has been and is, on the whole, more loyal to the pure Gospel than that of any other denomination. Especially is this true in this country and in recent years.

What is more, conservative men in the other denominations who are concerned for the preservation of the faith once delivered to the saints are beginning to recognize this fact. Indeed, not a few of them are saying clearly that in America the Lutheran Church must be especially looked to and depended on to stand firm in the coming years against the forces that are seeking to undermine both the integrity of the Word of God and the integrity of the faith founded on that Word. If time and space would permit, it would not be a difficult task to substantiate this claim for the Lutheran Church by well known facts and tendencies of the present day. So far concerning the right preaching of the Gospel as a distinctive mark of the Lutheran Church.

But the right administration of the sacraments is even more distinctive of the Lutheran Church and always has been than the right preaching of the Gospel. Here the difference between the Lutherans and the Romanists is radical and fundamental and most sweeping, and has been

so from the beginning of our history. For example, the Romanists recognize seven sacraments; we recognize but two, baptism and the Lord's Supper. They teach that the sacraments become effective and convey their blessings to the recipients of them without the exercise of faith, by the mere performance of the act by the priest; we teach that faith is always essential, and that when used without faith the sacraments bring condemnation and judgment rather than blessing.

Then, in regard to the Lord's Supper the Catholics hold and teach the doctrine of transubstantiation. That is, they believe and teach that when the priest pronounces over the elements the words of the institution, "This is my body," and "This is my blood," the bread and the wine are actually changed into the very flesh and blood of Christ. Hence they elevate "the host," that is, the consecrated wafer, before the congregation, and carry it in procession, and offer divine worship to it as to Christ Himself. We reject this teaching *in toto* and insist that the bread remains bread and the wine remains wine. Though our Lutheran theologians believe and teach that there is in the Lord's Supper a sacramental presence of the glorified body of Christ, they insist with equal positiveness that there is no change in the physical particles of either the bread or the wine. Hence they teach that it is idolatry to worship them. Moreover, because of their belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation, the Catholics also withhold the wine from the laity and administer only the bread to them, since, having been changed into the very flesh of the Lord this must include His blood also. We hold that the giving and receiving of both elements are essential to the completion of the sacrament.

Then, again, the Catholics teach that the administration of the Lord's Supper is a priestly act, and that each time it is celebrated it involves a repetition of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for sin. Hence, they call the Lord's Supper "the Sacrifice of the Mass." We believe and teach that Christ died on the cross of Calvary once for all for the sin of the world, and that this sacrifice never can



be, and never need be repeated, because it was all-sufficient for all time and for all men. We believe and teach that this is the very central truth of the Lord's Supper, and that all its blessings are connected with and were purchased by the atonement then and there made.

The Romanists further teach that because the celebration of the Mass, as they call it, is a priestly act, it can be performed by the priest alone without the presence of the congregation, and that when thus performed it becomes effective for the forgiveness of the sins and for the salvation of those in whose behalf it is celebrated, whether living or dead, without their participation. We teach that the celebration of the Lord's Supper is an act of the congregation, and that the officiating minister does not act as a priest but only as the chosen and accredited representative of the congregation, all of whom are kings and priests unto God. We also teach that the sacrament is not complete, and does not become effective as a sacrament, until the bread and the wine have been actually distributed, and received, and partaken of in faith by the communicants. We teach also that the blessings of the sacrament belong only to those who are present, and who actually communicate in humble reliance on the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ and believing the gracious promises of God our heavenly Father.

It is true that in all these particulars practically all the other Protestant denominations are in substantial agreement with the Lutheran Church concerning the sacraments. But they differ from us, or we from them, in some other things which must also be noted. For example, with very few exceptions non-Lutheran Protestants regard the sacraments as mere symbolical representations of truth, and teach that the blessings which accompany their use are purely subjective, such as the strengthening of faith, the quickening of love, and hope, and assurance in the efficacy of Christ's atonement for sin and the ultimate salvation of all who believe in Him. The only notable exception to this is that of the Presbyterians whose doctrine of the sacraments approaches very

closely to that of the Lutheran Church. With most of the others baptism becomes a mere act of confession and consecration, and the Lord's Supper is regarded as a mere memorial celebration of Christ's death, or a public confession of faith in Him and an act of Christian fellowship and love.

As over against all such inadequate and unworthy views of the sacraments, our Church teaches that they are divinely instituted rites through which God offers, and actually conveys, saving grace to all who receive them with faith in His Word, and seals to them forgiveness and salvation according to His promise. As Luther expresses it in his Catechism: "Baptism is not simply water, but it is the water comprehended in God's command, and connected with God's Word." And, again, still speaking of baptism, "It worketh forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe, as the word and promise of God declare." Concerning the Lord's Supper Luther says in the same precious little manual: "It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given unto us Christians to eat and drink, as it was instituted by Christ Himself." Of the benefits of the Lord's Supper He says, they "are pointed out in these words, 'given and shed for the remission of sins.' Namely, through these words, the remission of sins, life and salvation are granted unto us in the sacrament," when we receive it with "truly believing hearts." This is what is meant in the Augsburg Confession by the right administration of the sacraments, or the administration of them according to the Gospel, and this is the other distinctive mark of the Lutheran Church.

II. *The right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments are the true identification marks of the Lutheran Church.*

We are thinking now more especially of the identification of Lutherans among themselves, the identification of Lutherans by Lutherans. Whether we approve of secret societies or not, it is a well known fact that all such orga-



nizations have certain signs, and grips, and passwords by which their members may recognize and identify each other as brethren, with common bonds and common interests, wherever they may chance to meet, even though it may be as strangers in a strange land. In some of the histories of the battle of Gettysburg an interesting story is told that well illustrates this. General Armistead was leading the advance in Pickett's charge on the afternoon of the third day when the Confederates broke over the stone wall at "The Angle," near what is now known as the "High Water Mark" monument. Just a few yards within the stone wall or fence, when the Union and Confederate lines were all confused and the men were actually fighting hand to hand with clubbed muskets, General Armistead fell mortally wounded. As he fell he gave the cry of distress of the Masonic Order, and immediately several Union officers who were also Masons, sprang to his relief. He was their political and their military foe. For several years he had been arrayed in deadly conflict with them and had been seeking to destroy the government which they were sworn to defend with their lives. At the very time that he was wounded he would not have hesitated to slay them with his own sword if this had become necessary in the exigencies of war. Yet the moment he was disabled, and gave the signal referred to, by which they recognized him as a brother Mason, they were ready to minister to his necessities with all possible tenderness and care.

It is important that Lutherans should have some such mark or marks of identification by which they may be able to recognize each other whenever and wherever they meet. Especially is it important, for reasons of good order, and for soundness of doctrine and co-operation in work, that Lutheran churches should have some such marks by which they may know each other as really Lutheran. It is also important that these marks should be reduced to the lowest possible minimum of requirement consistent with safety, and that they should be simple, and easily discovered and applied, at the same time that they

are truly characteristic and distinctive. What shall these marks be? Or, rather, what are they?

Some Lutherans, it would seem, look for such marks of identification in nationality, or in language. Some, apparently, would find them in forms of worship, or in certain rites and ceremonies, some in methods of work, and some in the cut of the preacher's clothes, or in the vestments which he uses in the pulpit. A lady who was visiting in a city at some distance from her home sought out a Lutheran church in which to worship on the Lord's Day. At the close of the service she tarried to speak to the pastor. She gave him her name and home address, and also mentioned the name of her own pastor. "Does he wear the robe?" was the minister's first question. The wearing of the robe in the pulpit seems to have been for him the chief identification mark of a Lutheran minister.

If I may be permitted a personal remark in such a paper, I would say that I have come to like the use of the robe by Lutheran ministers in the conduct of service, though it required a long time and cost something of a struggle to overcome the prejudices of my early life when my training was all against such a practice. I also heartily favor the use of our historical forms of worship and methods of work. I sincerely believe that if all our pastors and churches would voluntarily adopt and use these historical forms and methods of work, it would be a great gain to us as a denomination, just as it is a great gain to an army to have all its units to wear the same uniform, and to use the same manual of arms, and have the same kind of weapons, and the same organization and general equipment. All this gives the army as a whole a sense of unity and solidarity, and develops a spirit of loyalty and devotion, what we call *esprit de corps*. It makes it a better fighting machine, a more efficient and more dependable organization for either offensive or defensive warfare. I am sure that a more general agreement in forms of worship and methods of work would do the same thing for the Church. At the same time, the fact must be recognized that the real essentials of Lutheranism are not



found in any of these things, but in the right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments. Wherever these are found, there is found a Lutheran, or a Lutheran church, however widely they may differ from others in nationality, or in language, or in church polity, or in forms of worship and methods of work, or in a score of other things which never have been exactly the same at all times or in all our churches, or however much these differences may be deplored. The Reformers themselves say in the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, immediately following the definition of the Church with which we started, "To the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel, and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites and ceremonies, instituted by man, should be everywhere alike." As a matter of fact those old Reformers were a good deal broader and more liberal than some Lutherans of the present day.

III. *The right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments are the permanent marks of the Lutheran Church.*

These marks belong to the very genius of the Lutheran Church, and cannot be changed without changing its essential nature, and so endangering its very existence, or working a forfeiture of its right to the name Lutheran. In nature, many variations are found in the several animal and vegetable species at different times and in different places. These variations are necessary in order that each species may adjust itself to changing circumstances, or to changes of climate or habitat. Without such adaptation the species would perish. But underneath all these variations there are always some essential characteristics of each species which differentiate it from the other species and which always remain the same. If these were to change also then the species would cease to be the same species that it was. Even though it might continue to be called by the same name it would actually be a new, or at least a different species.

The same thing is true of the Lutheran Church. At different times in its history, and in different countries, it has varied greatly in organization and polity, in forms of worship and methods of work, and in rites and ceremonies, during the four hundred years of its history. Even at the present time, there is no general uniformity in these things. In some countries the government is episcopal. In some it is collegial or consistorial. In others, as with us here in America, it is synodical or congregational. In some countries the Lutheran Church is recognized as the State Church, and is supported and at least in large measure controlled by the State. In others, as with us again in the United States, it is entirely free from the State, and is supported by the voluntary contributions of the members who also elect and call their own pastors and govern themselves in a most democratic way. In some cases the forms of worship are quite elaborate, in other cases they are very simple.

No doubt, there will always be these or similar variations in non-essentials. The Lutheran Church is too great and too widely distributed in the world, it belongs to too many lands and speaks too many languages, it has lived under too many conditions and has too many different traditions, ever to be expected to present an entire uniformity. At the same time, it must be remembered that the Lutheran Church has never looked with favor, or even with tolerance, upon a condition of anarchy, or of extreme individualism. With all its variations, it has never accepted the principle that each congregation should be a law unto itself, or that each pastor should do just as he pleases, even in these matters in which there is liberty, and in which there never has been entire uniformity throughout the whole Church. In the great Lutheran lands of Europe, as in Germany for example, and in Denmark and Norway and Sweden, with all the divergencies between different states or provinces or nations, there is always general uniformity among the churches of each separate state or province, and in most if not all of them such uniformity is required by law. Even in this country, where the Church is free from



State control, the several synods, and especially the several general bodies, at least aim at a general uniformity in the churches connected with them, even when they do not try strictly to enforce it. Such action, however, is based on the law of expedience rather than on the law of necessity, though it is an expediency which is generally recognized except by extreme individualists, of whom unfortunately we have all too many.

Two principles are always at work in the development of the Church. One is the principle of conservation. The other is the principle of progress. The first seeks to preserve in and for the Church those things which are essential to its life and continuity. The second aims to make room for and to regulate those adaptations to changing times and circumstances which are equally necessary to the Church's life and growth. These two principles and their respective advocates have always been more or less at variance and in conflict in the Lutheran Church, as they have no doubt been in all the denominations and always will be. On the one hand, we have had, and still have, those who are so conservative that they will allow no room for any change or progress. They insist that all things must always remain absolutely the same. On the other hand, we have those who are always straining at the leash and wanting to revolutionize everything in and about the Church and to change its very nature. It is not easy to maintain a proper equilibrium between these two principles, or parties.

But in the face of this conflict, and in the face of the variations that have grown out of it, this one thing should always be kept in mind, that in the right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments, we have the true, essential and permanent marks of the Lutheran Church which cannot be changed without peril to its very life and existence as the Lutheran Church. Hence, however tolerant we may be of other differences and variations, as true and loyal Lutherans we must hold fast to these as to things which cannot be shaken.

IV. *The right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments are, or of right ought to*

*be, a sufficient basis for Lutheran unity and co-operation.*

Mark that it is Lutheran unity and co-operation that I speak of, not Lutheran union. There is a wide difference between union and unity. Much more might be required for the former than for the latter. If we would have all the Lutherans, even in this country, to come together in one general body, so as to form one great, compact organization, we would need to be agreed on a number of things. For a peaceful and happy married life it is no doubt necessary that a man and a woman should agree on more than two things, no matter how important or how vital these two things might be. But it would seem that much less would be necessary for two people, or any number of people, to live in peace and harmony as neighbors, and even to co-operate in many common interests and tasks. This should be especially the case if these people belonged to one family and had a common name. It should be still more possible if they were all true believers in and true disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Moreover, the right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments furnish a much broader basis for Lutheran unity and co-operation than might appear at first thought. They certainly would include everything that is contained in Luther's Catechism, for it is there that we get the simplest and the best statement of the substance of the Gospel, and the clearest definition of the sacraments, according to the Lutheran conception. It would hardly be going too far to say that the right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments include, or involve, at least the substance of every article of the Augsburg Confession. The Augsburg Confession was, for the most part, just a formal statement by the Reformers of what they believed and taught concerning the Gospel and the sacraments. Luther's Catechism and the Augsburg Confession are the only writings that have been universally accepted as of confessional authority by all Lutherans of every age and of every land.

But, alas, for human frailty and ecclesiastical narrowness and bigotry. The difficulty with us as Lutherans is,



and always has been, that too many of our pastors and people are like the old Jewish rabbis and Pharisees. The rabbis had drawn so many inferences from the law given by Moses, and had added to it so many refinements of their own, that they finally became an intolerable burden. So there has been a disposition among our Lutheran theologians not to be content with the simple statements of the truths of the Gospel found in the Augsburg Confession and in Luther's Catechism, but to keep on drawing theological inferences and adding doctrinal refinements almost *ad infinitum*, and then to insist on the acceptance of all these, in spirit as well as in letter, as well as of the essential truth itself, in order to have any Lutheran fellowship or co-operation. Then, there were the old Jewish Pharisees. These men were so self-righteous and self-complacent, and so afraid that they might contract some defilement by contact with some person or thing that was ceremonially unclean, that they hedged themselves about with a fence of exclusiveness and would hardly associate with any one not of their own exclusive class.

Just so we have Lutherans who are so narrow and partisan in their Lutheranism that when they find a Lutheran church or pastor that is not in the fullest accord with them in every refinement of doctrine, and in every particular form and ceremony, and in every last minutia of practical organization and work, they gather their ecclesiastical robes about them and turn away, or pass by far on the other side, lest they should compromise themselves by too friendly association with a Lutheran who might not be of their own special brand. It must be said also in all fairness and candor that these separatistic Lutherans do not all belong to any one body. They are not all of what we might call the extreme conservatives. Not a few, who would like to be considered very broad-minded and liberal, are just as narrow and illiberal as the most exclusive conservatives when it comes to a matter of Lutheran unity and co-operation. It is just this Lutheran exclusiveness and narrowness that gives occasion to men like Dr. Carroll, the religious statistician of this



country, to insist that there are from sixteen to twenty-seven kinds of Lutherans in the United States. The attitude of Lutherans towards each other, and their treatment of each other, go far towards justifying such a conclusion on the part of outsiders. What we all need to learn is that wherever we find the two distinctive and permanent marks of Lutheranism, the right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments, we ought to be ready to recognize each other as of the same household and brethren of a common faith, however much we may differ in other and minor things. All such Lutherans ought to be ready to walk and work together in fraternal love and unity. Lutherans should learn to keep these really big things, these fundamental things, to the fore in all their thinking and in all their intercourse with each other, and to let all the things of minor importance fall back into the subordinate places where they properly belong.

If all the Lutherans in this country, numbering nearly four millions of baptized members and two and a half millions of confirmed members, were to rise to such a broad and catholic spirit of fraternity and unity, then we might expect soon to see our beloved Church taking its rightful place among the leaders of the great hosts of Protestantism. Then might we expect to see it grandly fulfilling the mission for which God called it into being out of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and for which we believe that He has preserved it through all the intervening years. Is it too much to hope and pray that this may be at least one result of our quadricentennial celebration, that as we meet and talk together of our common history, and our common faith and work, we will all come to a better understanding of what is really essential to true Lutheranism, and also to a better understanding of each other, and a more fraternal attitude towards all who bear the Lutheran name and can show the distinctive family marks, the right preaching of the Gospel and the right administration of the sacraments?

*Gettysburg, Pa.*



## ARTICLE III.

## LUTHER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD SCRIPTURE.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D.

When Luther was made a Doctor of Theology at Wittenberg, on October 19, 1512, through the solemn ceremonial of investiture, a new task was upon him—one from which, because of a sense of his own inadequacy he shrank, and yet one through which he was to perform an unparalleled service to all oncoming generations. This task was the presentation in systematic form, before his university hearers, of the Holy Scriptures. He apparently began with the Psalms, a natural procedure for a man at once critically and spiritually aglow with his subject, and yet hesitant of the ability he possessed to do the larger work laid upon him. The first book extant from Luther is this "Elucidation of the Psalms," in 1514. In 1517 came the "Penitential Psalms" and in 1519, "Operationes in Psalmos." His "Notes or Annotations" on the Psalms, doubtless the basis of lectures of 1516, are often termed "Initia Lutheri," the "Beginnings of Luther." After this followed with rapid succession sermons, letters, writings of various orders and objects. Through them all, however diverse their topics or specialized their characters, there runs a principle of procedure, a method of analysis which is sufficiently obvious. It is: How does this topic or matter relate itself to the body of writing collated in the Canons of the Old and New Testaments?

In the very first sermon of Luther preserved in the German language, on "St. Martin's Day" of 1515, he discusses this topic—how Scripture is to be properly understood. "The Scriptures are the source of knowledge, true enough," he says, "but they are not to be stretched and led according to one's own feelings but to lead to the Cross of Christ. Then there will be no difficulty in getting right results." (Koestlin I-126). In the "Ninety-five Theses"

of 1517, Luther insists that (62) "The true treasure of the Church is the *Holy Gospel* of the glory and grace of God."

Of course, when in the matter of true Penitence, over against the indulgences then promiscuously peddled by the authority of the Curia, Luther is obliged sharply to limit the Papal authority, he found himself "nolens volens" in ultimate reliance upon Scripture.

In his argumentation he found himself with few ecclesiastical authorities to support his position. His views seemed out of touch with those of the leading expositors of church doctrine of his day. This must have forced its way gradually to the consciousness of Luther, and such consciousness thrust him towards his final theological standpoint. What had he to urge against the current set by the Church for the age? In what way could he have weight against Papal and Conciliar authorities? The one recourse possible and sufficient was the naked Word, the Sacred Scripture, the sayings of the Lord Jesus.

When he is discussing Priestly Absolution, Luther goes at once to the Word of the Gospel for the argument. Against the Romish position he quotes Matthew 16. We do not read, "Whatsoever *I* shall have loosed in heaven shall be loosed on earth," but "Whatsoever *thou* shalt have loosed on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Koestlin I-257). In the matter of the absolution Luther insists now that the validity and value of it lie not in the dignity of the ecclesiastical pronouncing it but solely in Christ's Word of Promise, and this because the Word of Christ abides. It is fact, and it is final. What if the priest should make mistakes? Ah, well, the forgiveness rests not upon the word of the priest but upon the Word of Christ, and faith in this Word would secure peace to the heart even though the priest had pronounced the absolution with the utmost levity. "The Keys do not err, even though he who bears them be a trifler" (Koestlin I-259). There is thus objectively through the Word of God, and through this objectivity certainty to the soul.

When Luther comes to the doctrine of the Church a



change here too is manifest in his attitude. He says to Prierias, "I know no church virtually except in Christ, none in a representative sense except in a council" (Erlanger XX-185). He subordinates the authority of the pope to that of a General Council, and the authority of the council to that of the Scriptures. He says, "I propose to advance nothing which is not contained first of all in the Sacred Scriptures (Koestlin I-278). In his discussion with Cajetan relative to the exalted papal claims, he is willing, and does, assert that the pope's use of Scripture in supporting such claims is inapt and unwarranted; that papal decretals are errorless only when they are in harmony with Holy Scripture. He even cites with approval an earlier ecclesiastical maxim that in matters of faith even a believer stands above the pope if he supports his position by better authorities and arguments (Koestlin I-280). The words of Scripture are to be preferred always and ardently to any words of men. If all the teaching of the Church should teach this or that, it all would be nothing as over against a single passage of Scripture. Here he quotes Galatians 1:8: "Though an angel from heaven should preach any other Gospel than we have preached, let him be anathema." (Erlangen 27-12). When in his debate with Eck he was vauntingly asked if he thought himself alone to be right though he was opposed by Thomas Aquinas and all the Church Fathers, Luther quietly but firmly declared, "Let Christ be with me and His Word, and I do not fear what the whole world can do to me."

When through the indulgence controversy the matter of the sacraments came under consideration, Luther asserted that "Faith alone secures the sacramental grace, and that this faith has its assurance in the Word of grace that is the promise connected with the sacrament." Here already, as later, Luther attributes to the Word all essential value. It is the universal means of grace which saves wherever it is dispensed and believed. This occurs when Gospel is proclaimed and sacrament administered. (Koestlin I-287). Luther, as Koestlin informs us, sup-



ports this position by appealing to the fact that the Church does not allow the Mass to be held without reading the Gospel; for, "Man liveth by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God, as the Lord further teaches in John 6:2."

When Luther comes to discuss the "Keys," before ever he takes up at all the historical argument, he investigates the case by the measurement of Scripture. He asserts that the Keys are not given to the pope but to the Church on the basis of the confession of Peter, arguing from Matthew 16 and the passage in John 21:15-17 when the Lord asks Peter, "Lovest thou Me? Then feed My sheep," showing that Peter did not send out the apostles but was himself sent. In Galatians 2 Paul mentions James before Peter as one of the Church pillars. Luther often returns to I Corinthians 3:22, "Whether of Paul or Apollos or Cephas." He notes I Corinthians 12:28, where governments are spoken of but Peter not singled out. Paul, in Galatians 2:8, 9, is given a greater field than that assigned to Peter. Neither Paul nor Barnabas is ordained by Peter, and in Revelation 21:14, where the twelve apostles are represented by the twelve foundations, no differences or distinctions of any kind are made. We have carried out this argument explicitly to show how Luther based his position first and last on Scripture.

In speaking of the Church Fathers, he does not hesitate to condemn their misapplication of Scriptural passages, even including Augustine in that category. He is willing to enter the lists against all the Fathers on the basis of an Apostolic Word. He derides Eck who understands the Words of Scripture in accord with the words of the Fathers, while he proposes to follow up the stream to the fountain—that is, the Word itself. He will hold nothing true because it is the view of the Fathers. He maintains the individual Christian's right to prove all things and hold fast that which is good (Luther's Letters, General Edition, 281). Nay, the Church even has no right at all, upon its own authority, to declare a writing canonical.



Indeed, he asserts that the Church can give to a book no more authority than it has in itself. (Koestlin I-317.)

When in 1520 he is discussing the *Mass*, in his sermon "von dem neuen Testament," Luther says, "The nearer our masses are to the first Mass of Christ, the better they are beyond doubt; and the farther off from that they are, the greater the peril. But the whole mass with its nature, work, benefit, and fruit lies, Luther thinks, in the very words of Christ with which He celebrated it and commands us to celebrate it. Does Luther speak of the Church? It is the Communion of the Saints. This, he says, is how the Holy Scripture speaks of it. He argues the character of the Church from Ephesians 4:5, John 18:36, Luke 17:20, and Matthew 24:23, 26. It is the Community of the Saints to which Christ sent His messengers with equal power, that is with His Word, His Message. As for the pope, Luther insists that all that the pope appoints and determines he will accept only in the sense that he will test it by the Holy Scriptures. (Letters, General Edition I-451). In his address to the German nobility, Luther demolishes the three walls Rome has built around her. It is a scriptural demolition. The first is that the spiritual authority has power over the secular. "Not so," says Luther, "the Church has to do only with the ministry of the Word." The second wall is that the pope has the right to interpret Scripture. "No," says Luther, "we are all priests before God." How does he find this revolutionary truth? From the Scriptures. The third wall—that the pope alone can call a council—he shatters on the Scriptures, that we must oppose pope or prelate or peasant who does anything contrary to the Word of God.

For the benefit of Scripture Luther asks at this time for an entire revision of the course of study at the German universities. Over against the "blind heathen master" Aristotle, the theologians should rather be teachers of the Holy Scriptures. The Fathers are now studied in such a way that the students never come to the Scriptures themselves. Also in lower schools, the Scriptures should be

the chief text-book. There ought to be schools for boys and girls in which the Gospel should be taught. Everywhere learning is neglected, the youth languish because they have no Gospel.

When next Luther in his sermon "von der Taufe" discusses baptism, he lays emphasis first of all on the divine ordinance given in the Word, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." It is the Word with which Luther is ever busied. The Word is the determinator, the adjuster. And in his discussion of infant baptism, Luther asks how these infants may be saved, since they can not as yet hear the Word, and without such hearing no one can believe. (Romans 10:14). And in his sermon on "Maundy" Thursday, 1518, upon the proper preparation for the sacrament, he answers "Just as the Word of God is able to change even the heart of the wicked man which is no less deaf and incapable than any child, so through the congregation's infused faith is the little child renewed. Faith in what? The Christ revealed through the Word." (Erlangen Edition XVII-62).

Coming now to his treatise on *Christian Liberty*, Luther urges that the inward man is awakened to life by the Word. "The soul," he says, "has nothing at all on which to live and be free but the holy Word of God, the Gospel of Christ." (De libertate Christiana I-463). If it has but the Word, he is sure it needs nothing else whatever. In the Word it has full satisfaction, food, peace, justification, truth, liberty—all that is good. It was for the proclamation of the Word that Christ came and that Apostles and ministers have been ordained. But this Word is the Gospel in which God speaks of His Incarnate and Glorified Son. (Koestlin I-412). So that while, according to Luther, the third virtue of faith is *union with Christ*, the second virtue of faith *glorify God*, the very first virtue of faith is *clinging to the Word*.

When later, after the retirement from the Wartburg, Luther comes to discuss the vows of priests and the life of monks and nuns, he begins by saying that monastic vows have no Scriptural authority. There is absolutely no



basic justification for them in Holy Scripture. In the entire presentation, Luther is fixed in his position that the matter of monkish life is to be fixed by the directions of Christ, and that these directions of Christ are to be found only and solely in the Word. He condemns everything that falls short of, or is aside from, or beyond, Christ, even though brought by an angel from heaven. One sees how this limits the Word alone. Luther has grown at once by outward necessity and by inward conviction into this attitude of unlimited subjection to the Word. The Scriptures become Luther's absolute authority. Nothing belongs to saving truth except that comprehended in a definite Scripture. "The Scriptures are the supreme rule of saving truth," in that all truth must flow from them as a heavenly source. In matters religious, Luther distinguishes between things "inferior and superior." It is in the latter, that is, in things relating to God Himself, that we must be sure that we have His commands, His messages from His word. In matter of soul salvation, that which is not commanded is thereby inhibited. He quotes Deuteronomy 4:2, "Ye shall not add unto the Word" (Luther's Letters, General Edition II-291). "Beyond the Scriptures nothing must be appointed, or if anything be appointed it must be regarded as voluntary and not necessary." To this sharp definiteness in Scripture has Luther come. (Erlangen Edition 28-70).

Now at this stage of Luther's theological development and with the process of his thinking as related to the Scriptures, thus somewhat clearly before us, it will be admissible to generalize therefrom, and by induction to form certain conclusions warranted by the matter that has passed under review. The very first of the deductions would be that Luther, in all matters of the relation of man to God or of man to his brother man, makes the Word the final authority, the absolute; that is, there is a finality in the Word. His Worms attitude is not only a specific case; it is a characteristic case. It marks not only a decision, but it also determines a habitude. It is this that makes the words of Luther on that occasion momentous alike to

Luther and to civilization, "Unless I be refuted by Scriptural testimonies or by clear arguments—for I believe neither the pope nor the council alone, since it is clear that they have often erred and contradicted one another—I am convinced by the passages of Scripture which I have cited, and my conscience is bound in the Word of God. I can not and will not recant anything, since it is insecure and dangerous to act against conscience (conscience being to Luther 'tied to the Word')." The ultimate for him here is Scripture, and Scripture alone. This is not only specific heroism; it is generic history.

It is obvious from what has gone before that Luther had fought his way through the mental miasma and obscurations of the self-claimed papal prerogative. So far as he is concerned, neither curia nor council has any more final voice in matters on which Scripture speaks. Of course, this is revolutionary, and that is why it may be very properly said that the Reformation is also a Revolution. Between Scripture and ecclesiastical authority, Luther yielded allegiance to the former. There is another contention for the place of authority. That is reason. Luther, in his earlier discussions, often uses it. He had said just after the "Ninety-five Theses," "What the Holy Father proves from Scripture or reason, I accept; the rest I let pass as a pious fancy." (Erlangen Edition 27-21). But as he puts away the pope as authority, his mind comes more and more under the domination of the Word alone, and later he rarely, if ever, employs expression, coupling reason with Scripture. (Koestlin II-266). "For reason, though it comprehends what God is not, does not comprehend what God is." So that when Luther even refers to the decisions of reason, it is clear that he does not intend a use of reason independent of Scripture but rather an inferential use of it on the part of one who is himself in an attitude of obedience to the Divine. (Koestlin II-266). Thus to Luther, over against curia or "ratio," the Word alone arbitrates and determines. This position of Luther is a Reformation position. To the Lutheran reformer preaching the Gospel, the Word, is ab-



solute. By the Augustana this whole matter is taken for granted. It argues from, establishes by, and harmonizes with the Word of God. (See Schodde, LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, 21:470).

The Formula of Concord begins by the asseveration that, "We believe, teach, and confess that the only rule and guide according to which all teachers and doctrines shall be directed and judged are alone the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments." The eighteenth article of the Augustana tells us that the righteousness of God is "wrought in the heart when men do receive the Spirit of God through the Word." The Apology states: God can not be apprehended save by the Word. The Formula of Concord remarks, "articles of faith should be judged only from God's Word." To add further proof of the proposition involved and under discussion would be "carrying coals to Newcastle." Suffice it to say, alike to Luther and the Lutheran symbols and expositors of the Reformation—the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Supreme Court and without appeal. Luther says, "the norm of truth, the Christian's true doctrine." To them it was not "Roma locuta," but "Scriptura locuta," and when the Scriptures had spoken, there was the end of the matter.

The second deduction which is a corollary of the first and equally well authenticated by the facts in the case is that, to Luther, this Word of the Scripture, on which so much was made to depend, is in very deed a Word from God—a Word, the Word of God. We have here following the finality of the Word, its divinity. The power of the Word, which became more and more self-evidencing to Luther, compelled him to recognize the one source from which such a dynamic could come. So that Luther fastened Scripture back into heavenly places. The Word was, in the very first place, very essential to him for his work. The instrument dared not be weak. Too much depended on it. Then later it became essential to his nature. He had explored it. It had found him. Through it he was a twice born man. He sensed the God in it.

Luther knows that God is "for us" and "in us." But to know that, God must intercede through a special revelation. This He has done. It is the Word, the Scriptures. Luther characterizes the Sacred Scriptures as "the Book given by God the Holy Spirit to the Church." This Scripture is the rule of faith and practice. To Luther it is now "the Scriptures," now "the Word of God." There is a revelation. It is in His Word. The Word is the inclusion of Scripture. When Luther speaks of God's Word he has the Scripture in mind as shown in the Larger Catechism in the explanation of the Third Commandment, "But God's Word is the treasure which sanctifies everything, whatever be the hour when God's Word is preached, taught, heard, read or meditated on," the first use of "Word" here being equivalent to God's Word, the second equivalent to Scripture. Yet in spite of Luther's interchangeable use of Scripture and Word, we have no intention of saying that he used them thus as an absolutely accurate or logical explanation, but only—and that is the chief thing to express the natural impulse of his soul—when he was thinking of the divine goodness in His great redemptive revelation. Luther was only at rare times technically, logically, or philosophically critical. But he was always redemptively critical. To him the Scriptures were divine because given of God. This is an advance over a Scripture given by the Church. This latter attitude was the practically accepted one of Luther's time. Luther claimed the Church does not make the Word, but is made by it. By that Luther thinks back of the Word, written or even yet unwritten, to the essential Word, the "Logos" of the Gospels. He disagrees flatly with Augustine's *dixit*, "I would not believe the Gospel unless the authority of the Church Catholic endorses it." (Koestlin II-224). The very basis of our faith in the Gospel is found in this alone—that it is the Word of God. His conviction of the Scriptures as God's Word is simply overwhelming. This conviction brought him the message for which he proffered his life and freely dared death. If you read his prayers or follow his life, you will in each



case sense the source of his power. It is the Word. Yet holding to the Word with all integrity, he freely acknowledged its technical and intellectual difficulties. He sees some confusion; he recognizes some disharmony. But these things weigh with him not at all. There is Scripture! It is the divine truth. It is for men's salvation and perfectly accomplishes its perfectly appointed task. Luther sees this task accomplished through a Divine Word given through men, God's men, yet men. He sees in the "Word Written," as in the "Word Incarnate," the Divine-human; both needed to take on human form that they might appeal to the human. But the Divine-human Word like the Divine-human Christ reached the heart of things spiritual and is the expression final and perfect of the Infinite One. Having in his soul this absolute assurance of the unconquerable Christ, Luther was quite free in his estimate of the details of Scripture. His attitude to the book of James is well known. He is critical besides of Esther, Hebrews and Jude. (Erlangen 62-130; 63-155; 63-158). He is dubious as to the book of Revelation. (Erlangen 8-21, 22). Here and there he is quite free in the acknowledgment of textual difficulties arising in an attempt at a clear harmonization of the New Testament narratives. He says indeed at one place quite crossly, "In case of contradiction in Holy Scripture which one can not harmonize, just let it go." (Erlangen 46-175). Yet Luther was careful to state that these views were personal. On "James" he states that he would not lay anything in the way of others' placing the book as they will, since it has many good points. (Preface 1522-James). His critical attitude is not wholly subjective. While he did not like that "hard knot," the denial of repentance in certain cases (Hebrews 6:10), yet he also gives as a ground for thinking it less weighty that it was held by the earlier Church in a "different repute." (Koestlin II-243). Luther's attitude on these technical matters was apt to, and did, change from time to time. In 1521, of the Epistles of John he declared that "it had formerly appeared to him unprofitable, but that he had

come to see that in conjunction with Peter it was intended to bear witness against the pope, against anti-Christian propagation." (Koestlin II-247).

In all this, Luther's intent was pragmatic. "He was driven to the Holy Scriptures by the necessities of Christian life and makes no effort to construct a symmetrical system or to present an exhaustive summary of their contents, but only attempts to draw from them answers to the questions which from time to time he was called to give." (Jacob's *Luther*, 349). Hence his critical positions on the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were always shaped by this general attitude of Scriptural need and Scriptural efficiency. So that Luther's real attitude to the Scriptures is rather to be had not from formal or technical discussions of inerrancy or inspiration "per se," but from Luther's assurance of faith. His relation to Scripture is not so much to be gleaned from what he actually says concerning the books, but the manner in which he uses them. And from this point the evidences are simply overwhelming that the Scriptures are for him the inspired and authoritative Word of God, the basis and source of which certainly was not objective demonstrations, nor logical archaeological, historical, or philological evidence, but the subjective experience of the Christian heart. (Schodde, *Lutheran Church Review*-168-April 1916). This evidence assured Martin Luther that the Word of Scripture directed to the heart of men was adequate to find that heart and to lead it into the green pastures and beside the still waters.

A third deduction gathered from Luther's Scripture statements and positions is that to him Scripture is more than even a divine record. It is additionally and supereminently a generating source of power. True enough, it records the divine. It also—and this is greater—mediates the divine. It thus leaps at once from a rule of faith to a source of life. The thing here emphasized is the communicated truth and the communicating power. The Holy Spirit breathed at the birth of the Word of God and breathes again and always when that Word is dispensed.



Thus, however it is to be defined, God moved when the Word was made, or he did when the world was formed. We may, and do, call it inspiration. Its nature, character, exact method may be non-determinal, but the Spirit Himself is there. Luther knew this and posited that this same Spirit also mediates His message, so that the message itself becomes the grace means. Of course, this whole view point comes about through the "Testimonium Spiriti Sancti." It appealed to Luther first of all and last of all as a specifically religious judgment and only incidentally and mediately as a judgment of history. "The spiritual integrity of the Scriptures and its self-canonizing, infallible spiritual authority are the Scripture's true support, and they impress themselves upon the heart by the power and action of the Holy Spirit." (Haas: Third Lutheran Conference-51). This same idea is finely put in the Larger Catechism: "For in the first place He has a peculiar congregation in the world, which is the mother that bears every Christian through the Word of God which He reveals and preaches and through which He illumines and kindles hearts that then understand and accept it, cling to it, and persevere in it." (Larger Catechism: Article II-77). In this wise to Luther and the Lutheran confessors, the books of our canon are spoken of as "Holy Scriptures" or "Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." The emphasis here is on the words *Holy, Apostolic, Prophetic* as attesting the presence of the divine factor—the third Person of the Holy Trinity. This factor is brought out by the Augsburg Confession, Article 18: "It," that is, spiritual righteousness, "is wrought in the heart, when men do receive the Spirit of God through the Word." Also (the 28th Article), "This power is put in execution only by preaching or teaching the Gospel,"—and further, "these things can not be got but by the ministry of the Word and Sacrament." The Spirit of God at the beginning of the Word is the surety of His present action in the Word. "The message of salvation gets its weight as a means of grace in the measure that the Holy Spirit was,

and is, active in its hearers," says Noexgen. (Noexgen-"Wessen des Heiligen Geistes"-232). Yet withal, Luther believed that the Holy Spirit exerted His energy with unequal strength and fullness on different recipients who spoke the Spirit's message. He says, "We may even say that Moses took the Ten Commandments, which had been from the very beginning imprinted on the hearts of men, from the Fathers (as Jesus did circumcision, John 7:21). He, Moses, derived the judicial ordinances largely from ancient customs, and may have adopted many things from the practice of surrounding nations." (Erlangen-9:253, 4). Of the Psalms, whose power took so great hold of Luther, he could say, "The special agency of the Spirit is manifest only in the peculiar fervency and power of their language in which they are unapproachable." (Koestlin II-253).

Yet all the time Luther's application of Scripture shows how not its human mediation but its divine basic and afflatus were the determining factors in his estimate. It is the Word conveying the Spirit, the Spirit ministering the Word. At an earlier time, when in controversy with the Heavenly Prophets, he says, "They do not direct inquiry to the external Word but direct them to their fools' paradise. They rip away the ladder by which the Spirit must come to us." (Erlangen 29-208; quoted by Koestlin II-44). This viewpoint of Luther followed by the Lutheran confession is of momentous significance. It gives to us a Word not orphaned but empowered. It magnifies God, the Creative Spirit, in His own message. It distinguishes us on the one hand from Roman Catholicism which emphasizes the Church, and on the other from the Reformed Church which has a tendency to emphasize a disembodied Spirit without laws of procedure or means of approach which all may know in a preached Word, a proclaimed Gospel. The writer took occasion in an article more than ten years ago to emphasize the Lutheran reverence of the Holy Spirit through the Word. There is a general impression yet to-day that the Lutheran Church minimizes the Holy Spirit. On the surface our



confession seems to bear this out. The Augustana gives no separate article to the Holy Spirit. Quite different are a number of confessions in the Reformed Church. The French Confession of 1559 has such a special "article 21" on the Holy Spirit. The Belgic Confession of 1561 has article II on this topic. The Scotch Confession of Faith of 1560 has in "article 12 of faith in the Holy Spirit"—a comprehensive discussion. The "39 Articles" has in the 1517 edition Article 5. The Confession of the Free Will Baptists, 1868, has chapter 6 on the Holy Spirit. The "25 articles" of the Methodists formulate the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in article 4. And the Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church in their summary of 1875 discusses the Holy Spirit in work and office. Theological treatises bear out the same disparity. For the Holy Spirit, Schmidt refers to his discussion of the Trinity. Martensen contents himself with three pages on the possession of the Spirit; Valentine four pages on the Holy Spirit as applying redemption. And Jacobs devotes three pages to the mission of the Holy Spirit, whereas Charles Hodge has eight on the subject, Pope and Whitefield, Methodists, 7 and 16 respectively. Turn to our hymns. The Book of Worship has six hymns to the Holy Spirit, the Presbyterian 18, the Methodist Episcopal 25. Prayers and sermons bear out the same distinction. Yet we are in confession, doctrine, and service children of the Spirit and do "believe in the Holy Ghost." We speak less of the Spirit because we speak more about the Word. Our usage in prayers, conversations and hymnology is largely an unconscious outworking of our Scripturally thought out faith. Ours is Luther's, "The Holy Ghost hath called me through the Gospel." It is Phillipe's "The Lutheran has the Spirit in the Word." We know the Holy Spirit whom we have not seen through the Word which we have seen. We speak of the Holy Spirit not so much in His essence or the mystery of His Being which remains hidden in eternity, but by the channel of His coming to us which is plainly ours in the Word. We long for the fullness of the Spirit, but we know that "the Spirit is no

where to be sought save in and with the Word." We are here true children of our fathers, and they are true children of the faith. If in our churches you hear less often the name "Holy Spirit," you do not less have the truth of the Holy Spirit, for it is just in the Lutheran Church that you hear so much and so urgently the Word. For proof of this, go again to the confessions, theologies, hymnals, sermons and literature of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, respectively. With the Reformed there is little on the Word save as "Bibliology." (See Shedd and Charles Hodge). With us there is very much. Compare Shedd on "the Word" as a means of grace with the splendid discussions of this heart of the Gospel doctrine in all Lutheran theology. In Lutheran sermons we know the use of and emphasis on the Word. Turn to the Book of Worship. What hymns do our congregations love to sing? Are they not such as, "Break Thou the Bread of Life, Dear Lord to Me," "O Word of God, Incarnate, O Wisdom from on High." Thus do we take undiluted the message and mass of the Holy Spirit into our churches and lives in accordance with the divinely marked channels which He Himself defines and blesses, the Word and Sacrament. We speak in terms not of the "unconscious" but of the "conscious," not of the "Divine essence" of the Third Person of the Trinity but of His "divine working in the Word." Thereby we rest joyously in the full truth of the Holy Spirit, and, making much of the Word, we honor the Spirit and are true children of Luther, true heirs of the Reformation. (See Tressler: "Do Lutherans delete the Holy Spirit?" Lutheran Observer, December 1, 1911). To us the Word is quick and powerful, Spirit begotten and Spirit begetting.

There is yet one other deduction which a study of Luther's relation to the Word permits us to make. And it is on a matter of some present day consequence. What is to be the test or determining factor by which the Word has been, or may be, known? Our very first deduction was that to Luther there is *finality* in the Word. It settles things referred to it and to which it refers. The sec-



ond, a corollary of the first, is the *divinity* of the Word. It settles things because of its source. It is from the heavenly spring divine. The third deduction we have seen to consist in the *virility* of the Word. It continues to beget life, just as it was itself by life begotten. And now, finally, there is another factor which is essential indeed to the other three. How shall we know this *finality*, this *divinity*, this *virility*? What is the determining factor? In answer, our fourth deduction may be expressed in this way: The finality, divinity, and virility of our Scriptures are to be ascertained, assured of, and experienced through one key only, but a key which Luther is confident always fits the lock and throws back the bolt. It is, "Do they have to do with Christ?" "For this," Luther says, "is to be the real test of all books, whether they have to do with Christ or not, since all Scripture evidences Christ (Romans 3:21), and Paul himself would know nothing but Christ. (I Corinthians 2:2). Whatever does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even if Peter or Paul taught it. On the other hand, whatever proclaims Christ is apostolic, even though Judas, Annas, Pilate and Herod did it." (Erlangen 63:157; quoted by Haas—third Lutheran Conference). The hardy outspokenness of Luther here is characteristic. He says again, "Christ allowed His hands, feet, and sides to be touched, so that the disciples might know Him of a surety. Why should we not likewise touch and test the Scriptures which is in truth Christ's spiritual body whether it really is that which we believe or not." (Erlangen 24-61). All Scripture is Scripture because it is a piece with the proclamation of Christ. If Scripture is not according to Christ, that very apartness shows it is not Holy Scripture, not the true Word. For written Word and incarnate Word must harmonize. The explicit Word and the implicit Word are one Word, the obverse and subverse of the one essential divine nature. There can not be essential disharmony. Therefore "Scripture is to be understood in harmony with Christ (Pro Christo), and if hence it is not capable of reference to Him, it is not to be con-

sidered as true Scripture." (Jena I-539; quoted by Koestlin). If we have the chief article of faith, that is, Jesus Christ, Son of God, and Lord, we may have stress of mind and distress of heart, but we shall escape disaster. If, Luther thinks, there might be disorder in the eschatological discourses of Matthew 24 versus Luke, or if John's placing of Peter's denial at the home of Caiaphas should be unable to be authenticated, or if we have question of the date of the purification of the temple, Luther refuses to be unduly concerned thereby asserting that these things will not take us to heaven nor to hell. (See Luther's Works—Erlangen Edition; quoted in *Theology of Luther*, page 256).

Luther's purpose in Scripture was the presentation of Christ and this authoritatively. Therefore only that is Scripture to him which bears witness to the Son. The Bible as history or literature has no significance in Luther's thought as a student or teacher. To him "they are they that bear witness to Me." (John 5:39). "If ye believed Moses ye would believe Me, for he wrote of Me; but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:46). This Scripture commanding attitude of Luther was not dangerous for him, though it might come to be to others. For Luther apprehended the Gospel within the Gospels, or rather was apprehended of it and had hence a true doctrine for Scripture determination. He would have said full often nowadays, as he looked upon our rationalistic, literal attitude, "O foolish men and slow of heart to believe, after all that the prophets have spoken." (Luke 24:25).

Luther's Scriptural interpretative capacity grew not only out of his personal attitude to Christ but at the same time from the grasp of the relationship and relativity of the Word. True, Luther despised Aristotle, yet he did not turn his back on the methods of true philosophy. His was no philosophic provincialism. He understood that since the worlds were framed by the Word of God, the Word must be an organism, a constructive whole, and not a mere unrelated storehouse of texts, a thesaurus



of co-ordinate passages. "The sundry times and divers names" give place to the "fullness of time" and the pivotal relation of the Son. That is, the Old Testament is understood by the New, and the New Testament is unlocked by Christ. Now this principle of Luther we ourselves follow in practice. When we can not have the whole Bible we carry a New Testament. When we teach or preach we are first of all interested not in the tabernacle nor the temple but in Jesus' relating us to God. In all this we are true children of Luther, when we hear Christ expounding in all Scripture "the things concerning Himself." (Luke 24:27).

Just as Luther determined what is Scripture by referring to its attitude to Christ, he likewise made the same principle the fundamental one in its interpretation when once it has been found. The Scripture is real revelation. There is not to be found a secondary or hidden meaning every time. The true interpretation is to be found by the principle of philosophical investigation. Saving truth is always to be found in Scripture, not obscurely but clearly taught. This he maintained over against the Romanists and over against the rationalists. The Word is simple enough that it need not necessarily be expounded by an infallible church, and it is certain enough because it carries with it supernaturally its own illuminating power, the Holy Spirit, the Revealer. The real expositor must first be a "good textualist." To this end he needs an understanding of the words of Scripture and, if he is to pass the Word along, of the languages of Scripture as well. To this he must add a general knowledge of the subjects discussed, that is the *organic Scripture* in all its systematic differentiations. After this the heart and mind are to have the present influence of the Holy Spirit. All this Luther subsumes in saying that the three requisites of efficient Scriptural interpretation are, "oratio, meditatio, tentatio." (Erlangen 22:184 and Erlangen 63:403 and Koestlin II-257). Of course, this leads back again to Luther's *Christ center*, for the Holy Spirit present in the Word has for His very business, the pre-

sentation of Jesus Christ. So that in all this we are following the maxim of Luther, "teach that which accords with faith in Christ." Thus, in the fixation of Scripture itself and in fixing of its meaning, that is in the determining of both the sphere and content of Scripture, Luther held this one objective in view. For this appealed to his sense of both philosophy and of divinity. It was reasonable and Scriptural that Christ should determine Scripture, and that Scripture should terminate in Christ. The Lutheran Church has on the whole held this principle to be one well validated by the consciousness of the Church and to be of value in practice because it holds ever back of the written Word, the Word that is Living; and thus putting the formal principle where it properly belongs, not co-ordinate with, but subordinate to the material principle, so that thereby Christ may be "all in all." This puts all honor on the divinely authoritative Word of God. For what higher honor can attach to it than this—that it is the Revealer of the Son of God?

*Springfield, Ohio.*



## ARTICLE IV.

HOW CAN WE TRANSMIT LUTHERAN TRUTH TO  
THE COMING GENERATION?

BY PROFESSOR C. B. GOHDES, LITT.D.

“For with thee is the fountain of life, and in thy light shall we see light.”—Ps. 36, 9.

“But I have this against thee that thou didst leave thy first love.”—Rev. 2, 4.

The future of the Lutheran Church! Dead the Lutheran heart must be that cannot vision a future for the Church of the Reformation. The Church of Luther and Melanchthon, of Spener and Franke, of Gerhard and Gerok, of Muhlenberg and Krauth; the mother of the great countries of the North that have become heirs of Roman power and of Greek devotion to art; the author of liberty that made our American home country a possibility by its conquest of the Papacy,—this Church should not have a future, a claim to power broadening and enlarging as the centuries come and go? And if the past of Lutheranism is prophetic of its future, for whom should this future be secure if not for the coming generation?

Hush! Grace may be lost by guilt; power may lapse into weakness; of a church as well as of a nation its glory may be a mere memory, and its history may be bounded by the past. Think of the seven churches of Asia Minor, to which the Lord sent warning from heaven through Saint John, the writer of Revelation. Greater men than Luther and Melanchthon were their founders; namely, divinely inspired apostles. A mightier voice pleaded with them than Luther's,—that of the Lord from heaven. The flight of many centuries had not dimmed yet the memory of that sight on Calvary—the Lamb of God redeeming the world with the crimson coin of his

blood. Yet, a few centuries after the warning of Christ had been transmitted through Saint John, everyone of those churches had passed away. The Mohammedan Crescent rose in Asia where the Cross had flamed. Why? Because those churches, while perpetuating the Christian name, doctrine and usages, had, in one way or another, lost Christ. Then God flung them away, and thus it came about that the descendants of martyr sires are followers of the soul-killing religion of Mohammed.

Passing great is the history of our Church also in this country, thank God! But there are chapters in it for which we cannot thank God, because they are records that someone has blundered. In our large cities and, here and there, also in the country, there are numerous persons and families of Lutheran blood that swell the membership of other churches. However, that is a loss that might be borne, provided Jesus Christ is preached to them. But what shall we say when hundreds of thousands of people, reared in Lutheran countries and homes—German, American, Finnish, Scandinavian—are found outside of any church communion whatever, are members of the world, where Satan reigns? Put the blame upon these prodigals: they deserve it! But is the assertion uncharitable that, frequently, there has been loss of power in the transmission of the faith from sire to son? Prayerless Lutheran homes, worldly Lutheran pastors, homes divided in the faith through mixed marriage, failure to worship in the children's language,—would to God that these causes had never existed, to account in a measure for the stray multitudes that know no longer the faith and worship of the fathers!

No! We do not mean coldly to censure the Church of our youth, the Church of our love, the glorious Church of the Reformation. Christ was not responsible for even a Judas in the college of apostles. The Church of the Reformation may apply to herself the words of Jesus addressed to the congregation of Ephesus: "I know thy



works, and thy toil and patience, and that thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them that call themselves apostles, and they are not, and didst find them false; and hast patience and didst bear for my name's sake, and hast not grown weary." This is the day when not only the love of many has grown cold, but the way of truth is spoken of as the way of superstition. Even in Protestant churches the authority of Scripture is made to give way to the swelling words of human authorities, who strut around in the brief day of their glory, soon to sink into the blackness of oblivion. The inspiration of Scripture is denied; so is the deity of Jesus Christ; in the schools of learning man is presented not as the creature of God, made in His image, marred and destroyed though it be by sin, but as the offspring of the beast through evolution,—his origin not God's father hand, but slime of the sea.

A destructive pestilence, the doctrine of evolution has successively spread over every field of thought. We find hints of submission to it in Tennyson's verse; we see the spiritual Henry Drummond turn the intellectual somersault of accommodating his faith to Darwin's fiction. We come upon traces of Darwinism in literature whose general scope and intrinsic worth make it all but a household necessity, such as *The Youth's Companion*. In not a few pulpits of orthodox tradition the truth of the evolution theory is quietly taken for granted, and the authority of God's Word correspondingly undermined.

Concerning the havoc thus made with the faith of the Church, there can be no two opinions. Sin as a hereditary corruption of the creative image of God ceases to call for repentance wherever Darwin and Haeckel have dictated the surrender of the First Article, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth." Sin, to an evolutionist, cannot be guilt to be gotten rid of through the blood of the Atonement. It is inchoate good, potential virtue, a merely transient stage of an unending

development in which every organic being, whether plant, animal, or man, as it sinks into the eternal, Easterless graveyard of defunct life, helps to heave up from the womb of Nature another phase of being, which is at least a little in advance of that which has been superseded. Darwinism has placed the science to which it has given its bent into opposition to all that prophet, apostle, and Christ have taught concerning sin. A Christian Anthropology and the prevailing evolution theory are mutually exclusive.

Nor can an Evangelical Soteriology stand alongside of Darwin's error. We shudder at the mere thought of correlating the august being and character of the Saviour with the dumb and blind forces which, according to Darwin, have crested in humanity, and flowered in the imperial products of the human mind. Yet, if Darwinism be true, we might as well relegate to the realm of fable those adorable processes whereby, in the virgin bosom of Mary, the Divine became interlinked with the human, and death was robbed of its sting in the only grave that never reeked of corruption's taint. With Darwinism as postulate of universal thought, the Religio-historical school appears consistent in dovetailing Holy Scripture with the principles of evolution, by asserting that, in the teaching of prophet and apostle, the religious thought of man has reached its highest stage of development, just as the epic poem reached it eight centuries before that in the poems of Homer, and architecture twelve centuries later in the perfection of Gothic art. The Bible, to a consistent evolutionist, is not the Word of God to man, but the highest thought of man concerning God, leaving open the possibility of greater things to come,—whether by Mrs. Eddy or by Sir Rabindranath Tagore, is presumably left to the individual to determine.

With Darwinian evolution theories in the ascendant, gone are the divine sanctions for the Moral Law, which, in the past, have been the protection of individual purity,



of the integrity of the family, and of the throne of government. Hear the modern pagan blasphemously sing what he calls his litany:

“I call Thee not infinite Love,  
 For unbeloved vast millions go;  
 Nor Infinite, Eternal Truth,  
 Since half our faiths from falsehood flow.  
 I call Thee not Omnipotence—  
 Who still lets degradation be;  
 Nor yet Omniscience—else Thine eyes  
 Most vainly see!  
 I call Thee not divine—if so  
 I must bow down to Thee in awe;  
 Nor unrelenting Fate—nor more  
 Relentless Law.  
 I call Thee but the World’s Great Life,  
 Who art myself, and fight with me  
 The Spirit-ward immortal strife  
 For what should be.”

But can life long remain a quest of the spirit for the spiritual, with no better faith than one emasculated by evolution? The quest of the spiritual is difficult even for a believer, since, even in the case of the best of us, his wings are ballasted by the downward-pressing weight of the flesh. But when the immortal mind is interpreted to be mere matter in function, as is done by Monism—the zenith of the evolutionary science, but true science’s very apogee—we may look for a relentless sway of the animal passions over society. Seneca, the Roman philosopher, could sing a panegyric of freedom; in actual life, however, he curried favor with the base freeman of a base emperor. He could write golden words about poverty; and at the same time, loan out, at usury, a stupendous fortune of ten million dollars. Sallust could rise in theory above the modern evolutionist, in that he ascribed man’s erect stature to his soaring spirit: that did not prevent the theorist along ethical lines from robbing, when he had the oppor-

tunity as Roman proconsul, all upon which he could lay his hands—the money of the rich and the virtue of the beautiful. With the Word of God dethroned, and Darwin and Haeckel recognized as tutelar deities in the fane of science, Ovid's sigh will presently become that of grovelling millions:

*"Video meliora proboque, Deteriora sequor."*

(What is good I see and approve, base is that which I do).

Woe to the age of Darwin! A civilization that forsakes the sign of the cross to march beneath that of the beast, must face either a reformation or a revolution. And how sadly and strangely silent is much of Protestantism over against this science of and from the slime!

But hark! Do you hear, in contrast to the swelling words of human wisdom, the voice of your Church? Without faltering, without a dissenting gesture, her pulpits, her schools, her press, lift up the old standard, honor the old truth, point to the old ways, glorify the old God and His Christ. Surely, if fidelity to the inspired Word of God means anything, this factor counts first in transmitting to the children the treasures of truth which generations of the faithful have transmitted to us. Our Church is Protestant in the noblest, truest sense; for she protests against whatever is intended to undermine the Rock of Ages, whether it be science or theology.

Still, even the protest against error will lose its force, unless its strength is Christ. It is indeed true that the hold our Church has upon the truth is largely due, under God, to the controversies waged by her against error, since the latter compelled a strong and clear formulation of the truth. Nevertheless, we do not pass on our wealth in Jesus and His grace by controversy, which is waged altogether too often with carnal weapons. The champion of the truth is too likely to defend himself and his own honor. The spirit of human rancor creeping into a controversy will repel the spirit of the gentle and patient Christ; and presently it is not the face of the champion of truth we see, but the stern face of the debater, whose



motive and light is that of human ire instead of Christ-like gentleness. Oh, what victories the early Christians won in the spirit of meekness! In their assemblies they would simply unfold the truth in Jesus, without endeavoring to set forth every feature of it by placing it against the background of corresponding error. Knowing that truth is not a spider that sucks the blood from the opponent, the Christians, in the age following that of the apostles, carefully avoiding acrimonious polemics, would merely extol grace and truth; and, subdued by their gentleness, scoffers that had come to spy upon them, were won by the love of Christ they had seen dripping from the lips of His disciples. Controversy, indeed, is needed; but, unless it is to repel the generation to come, He must be the soul of it who says, "I am the truth."

To reach the coming generation, the Church of the Reformation also has means and methods whose effectiveness has been tested by four centuries of history. While other churches, to whom the systematic presentation of the truth through catechization appears a mere human expedient, by means of the high pressure method of the "revival" will occasionally stir the stagnant pond of church life, only to see the waves "awakened" by them disappear again and again, the Church of the Reformation, faithful to the apostolic method of teaching, enriched the mind and heart of generation after generation with the treasures of truth. What better bridge can we find to the minds and consciences of the coming generation than the grand system of truth contained in our Confessions, especially Luther's Catechism, with which every Lutheran is acquainted before he is received at the altar? Drawn from the revealed Word of God by the fathers of the Church, this system of truth in vogue in the Church of the Reformation commends itself to generation after generation by its power to beget anew the life in Christ.

But listen! Every light casts a shadow, and there have been Lutherans who chose to dwell in the shadow; nor have they all disappeared yet. Jesus says, "I am the truth." The eternal value of doctrine is that it pre-

sents Christ in the various aspects of His divine personality and the various phases of His saving work. But when the truth, instead of being presented as the bright mirror of the saving Christ, is anatomized into its doctrinal parts in such a way that attention is centered in one or several of these instead of the Lord Jesus Himself; if the doctrinal elements of truth are presented in so one-sided a way that the Holy Spirit, for whom the truth is to serve as a bridge between the uncreated and the created heart, is shut out, then a new, a Lutheran, pope comes into being, whose sway may become a blight as truly as that of the pope of Rome. Dead orthodoxy is his name. No region, no generation, no section of the Church, has been altogether free from his scepter. The greatest foe of the truth is he that bears it upon his lips, but is a stranger to its life.

Contending for the faith once delivered to the saints is holy duty; but we shall never reach the coming generation with our message if we entrust it for transmission to the debater or to the zealot, who, by his acrid contention for a system, would lead us from living fellowship with the loving Christ.

The Lutheran Church has repeatedly met with checks, here and there even with dismal defeats. Some of these, no doubt, are due to a sluggish conservatism quite unworthy a Church that shook off the papal yoke virtually during the lifetime of Luther. Some of them are, no doubt, due to the failure to appreciate according to their deserts the treasures of Reformation truth and history, and to a spirit of self-depreciation that found vent in imitating the practice and introducing the principles of other churches, to a less degree bearers of Evangelical truth and power. Sometimes this imitativeness was, in a measure, the result of unfavorable linguistic factors. About a quarter of a century ago, when the horizon of the General Synod in the East was largely dominated by pastors who had no patience with distinctive Lutheran doctrine and practice, but would go out of their way to extend fraternal recognition to critics of Reformation principles,



and criticism to advocates of them, the trend of development taken by the American Lutheran Church since was expected by few. It was then that the writer took occasion to take issue with uncharitable critics by venturing this prophecy. I said: "One reason why many in the General Synod show themselves averse to an advanced position in doctrine and practice, is that tens of thousands of Lutherans have, by the inevitable process of Americanization, outgrown the trammels of foreign languages to which the treasures of Lutheran truth have been confined altogether too long. By reason of this linguistic change, in which the people become American faster than the Church, many have had access to no literature save that of Calvinistic complexion. But let the theology of the Church once express itself adequately in the language of America, and a change will be apparent where now it is least expected. Then it shall be seen that the very body which has become subject to criticism, has made a contribution of incalculable magnitude to the Lutheran Church, in that it has preserved for it a vast host of people who bring to their allegiance the treasure of American culture with all the opportunities thus entailed." This prophecy, as any one gifted with a fair mind is able to see, is at this very time in the last stages of fulfilment.

A Church largely united on the basis of truth, as the Lutheran Church of America has gotten to be, is indeed a power. But even a confessing Church harbors the seeds of disintegration, if the truth confessed is not applied as a vital principle. The truth that we are commanded to teach does not mean a dissertation upon doctrines detached from life. Christ is the truth, that He may be the way and the life; and only by letting Him become our Way and our Life, do we show that we have apprehended Him as the Truth. It is the purpose of every doctrine to show us the face of Christ, or some feature of His redemptive work; and always to be some factor in Christian holiness and activity. It is never the purpose of Christian doctrine to give occasion for spiritual gym-

nastics or bitter and barren controversy. How necessary, then, that the present or prospective teachers of others should prove the truth of the doctrine taught by them by exhibiting it as the power of the life hidden with Christ in God. Christ is indeed in the truth, no matter who proclaims it; but when the bearer of the truth is not himself a bearer of Christ, prejudice will be aroused against the truth, and an effective operation by it upon the heart of the hearer becomes impossible.

When we follow Francis Bacon upon his excursion into the realm of moral truth, we, three centuries after the philosopher's death, are dismayed at a character that manifested such deplorable union of high ideals and low desires. We applaud his teachings while we recoil from the craven, venal, sycophantic traits that virtually put his claim to sincerity out of countenance. How much graver is the offense of one for whom his occupation with spiritual things is a one-sided intellectual pursuit, unhallowed by prayer, productive of pride rather than humility, of strife rather than peace.

What guilt the man accumulates who shows familiarity with divine truth, but creates prejudice against it by the exhibition of a personality of which self is the controlling factor instead of Christ? It is inconceivable that truth lived as well as confessed should lead to ultimate defeat; but there are, and ever have been, sections in our dear Lutheran Church that have been blighted by the Lutheran brand of popery, or dead orthodoxy—a type of religion which would atone for disobedience to truth by a perfervid advocacy of its intellectual constituents. How much ground there is to take to heart the passionate lines of Zinzendorf:

“If you the trumpets of grace would sound,  
By grace yourselves must first be found.  
Make peace with God; from sin be freed  
By the cleansing blood of your holy creed—  
Then confess!”



We shall transmit Lutheran truth to the coming generation by showing the beauty of the Christ life in the present. Christianity is not a philosophy but a life. It is not mere contention for certain dogmas, but light, salt, leaven. The strength of the Church does not stand in the eloquence of her divines, nor in the charms of her choirs, nor in the wealth and culture of her people. It does not even stand in the correctness of her Confessions; for, unless proved by the divine power in our life, these are an indictment of unfaithful stewardship. The strength of the Church stands in one thing alone—godliness in the pulpit and godliness in the pew. Where this is found, there, and there alone, is the power to pass on the saving truth inherited from past generations to generations still unborn. The strength of the Church stands in the living faith of her people; and we shall pass on the truth to which we owe our possession of the Saviour to the coming generation if we exhibit the Lord Jesus in what we of the present generation are and do. God buries His workmen, but His work goes on. Let us, therefore, translate the Jesus message into the Jesus life! Let us tell the glory of the past in the story of the present! Let us show the beauty of the Christ in the duty of the Christian! Thus, experiencing and manifesting the power of the truth in the holiness and love of a life hidden with Christ in God, we may, when in awful beauty the last night comes darkling with glow of stars, confidently lay down life's labor in the assurance that the promise is to us and to our children—to all those for whom, in the power of a life hidden with Christ in God, we have become leaders to the Son of God.<sup>1</sup>

*Columbus, Ohio.*

\* Address delivered before the Faculty and Students of Hamma Divinity School.

## ARTICLE V.

## THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FORCES OF GERMANY.

BY WILLIAM CLINTON HEFFNER, A.M., PH.D. (U. OF PA.)

## PART II.

At certain periods in the religious and social development of the human race the disappearance of old forces and the rise of new ones converge and form climaxes. Scientifically we call them sympodial changes; historically, epochs; religiously, "the fullness of the times." Abraham, Moses, David, Christ, Constantine, Luther, Washington, Lincoln, are all gigantic peaks in the progress of humanity whom God raised up to lead the people through them. Born, educated and trained under the old regime, they rise above it and by some striking phrase as a rallying cry, "the just shall live by faith"; "this government cannot endure half slave and half free," direct humanity to the wider and larger opportunities awaiting it. The disappearance of the knights as the middle class of society and the rise of the bourgeois, the trading and the industrial groups, marks the climax that culminated in the Reformation era.

When Luther nailed the Ninety-five Theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg the world was essentially Mediaeval in thought and life. Luther as well as the other men associated with him were reared and educated by mediaeval methods and standards and consequently their thought, ways of life and views of things were mediaeval. The problems which came before them for solution had to be dealt with by the spirit of the age. In many instances extreme rigor and harshness was essentially necessary for their personal self-preservation as well as that of the principles for whose establishment they fought. Judgment in their case must be suspended,



unless we can judge them impartially in terms of the decayed mediaevalism in which they labored.

To cause an individualistic society; a society of democratic equality; to grow out of one in which class and caste was rampant, race prejudice and race inferiority the leading and guiding principle; was no easy task. Excuses and apologies need not be offered for vacillations in policies and changes in activities on the part of those upon whom the leadership devolved. It was a case of action not theory because the time was at hand for the transformation of the mediaeval feudalistic society into the modern individualistic; the mediaeval feudal state into the centralized bureaucratic and subsequent democratic with its system of salaried functionaries subject to a central authority chosen by the free expression of the will of the people in manhood suffrage, and the mediaeval church with its hierarchical organization based on the constitution of the ancient Roman world-empire into the democracy of "the universal priesthood of all believers."

The action of Luther in Wittenberg was regarded by the ruling classes and the supporters of mediaevalism as revolutionary in character, and tending to create a general revolution with all its direful consequences. The preaching and teaching of Christ marked the close of the old sacrificial form of worship and the introduction of the new, "They that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." This was the prophesied "fullness of time" which organized society in both Church and State, especially the leadership, failed to see and branded it as revolutionary. The work of Washington and the patriots of 1776 was likewise revolutionary because it barred the introduction of the rule of privilege in Church and State and established a free democracy in both. In 1861 a large portion of our country considered the declared views of Lincoln revolutionary and destructive of a society constructed on the inferiority of a race. All these climaxes, stages in the tide of social progress, broke down

old outworn forms and constructed new ones. The path of civilization has lain through trial, tribulation, sacrifice and suffering. The leaders in these respective steps of human progress are branded with the stigma of revolution on the one side and hailed and acclaimed as heroes on the other. In this Luther as well as those associated with him in laying the foundations for a universal democracy proved no exception.

The dogma of race inferiority is the bed-rock of societies governed by absolute and despotic forms of government irrespective of whether it is due to mental perversity or arrested culture. Mediaeval society was built solidly on this dogma. It was absolutely impossible for any one to conceive how it was possible for society to exist without it. Wherever it exists it makes the work of reform infinitely more difficult. Social democracy with its state of ideal equality is as repugnant to reigning dynasties to-day as was Luther's doctrine of "the universal priesthood of all believers" to the organized Church and State hierarchies of his day. To-day there are many people in the South who are cocksure of the superiority of the white race over the negro. The French feudal lord, though reduced to nullity, is still equally sure that he is the superior of the white serf who once existed on his domain. So also is the Magyar with respect to the Croatian, the Slovak and the Rumanian. The Prussian is likewise sure that he is divinely appointed to rule the world and possessed of the only real *Kultur*. The cardinalate of the Roman Church always has been and still is thoroughly convinced within itself that it is the divinely appointed dictator and administrator of the world both temporarily and spiritually. Powerful as is the spirit of race prejudice and race inferiority to-day it was a tremendously greater Himalya four centuries ago. It was the first of two frowning fortresses that confronted the reform inaugurated in 1517.

The second of the two fortresses was corruption. Corruption increased enormously with the extraordinary increase of economic wealth. Wealth is productive of



classes and distinctions on the one hand and perversion on the other. Perversion in the utilization of wealth may be either in luxury and extravagance or in bribery. In either case it creates a spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction as great as, if not greater than the racial issue. The two classics which express this better than any others are the "Vicious Circle" and the "Election of Charles V."

In the first part of our discussion we explained how the influx of wealth into Spain and Portugal by means of the spice trade of the Orient and the gold and silver from the newly discovered lands in the Occident created a very sharp advance in the prices of all commodities. The large quantities of the precious metals which poured into these countries not only lowered the purchasing power of the monetary unit but also greatly enlarged the scope of consumption of the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula as well as of those of Northern Europe, especially in Germany. Commercial and industrial Germany was rich in economic goods for which there was a strong demand in the peninsula and for which the people were willing to pay almost fabulous prices. Through the process of exchange the new wealth flowed into the treasuries of the middle class Germans in a seemingly unending stream. The increase in wealth was followed by an enormous increase in luxury and extravagance. Not only did it introduce the capitalistic regime in world commerce and industry, thereby greatly accentuating the lines of social cleavage, but it also undermined the morals and stalwart character of the sturdy German. Against this state of riotous living and accumulation of wealth two agencies hurled themselves. The stalwarts among whom were the reformers attacked it on moral and spiritual grounds while the existing regal and church hierarchy assailed it for financial motives. The latter resorted to every means of extortion and taxation for the purpose of drawing this wealth out of Germany, thereby supplying the real cause for the setting off by the former of the first blast against the Himalya of race inferiority, special privilege, intrigue and political and spiritual corrup-

tion on the night of October 31, 1517. The wealth thus extorted from the German people was utilized by the papacy to prosecute its political intrigue in Europe. The empire of Charles V was then in process of formation with headquarters in the Iberian Peninsula and thither ultimately the bulk of the wealth gravitated, ready to begin the circuit anew. The three points through which this circle was drawn were in Spain, in North Germany, and at Rome in the States of the Church. The product of the German artisan and the agriculturist was drawn into Spain and the gold and silver into the coffers of Rome thus bleeding Germany white. Luxury and extravagance were destroying the stalwart German character while graft and extortion were impoverishing the nation. To save Germany the breaking of the second arc of the "Vicious Circle" was an essential necessity. With the nailing up of the Ninety-five Theses Luther drove the severing wedge into the second arc.

At this time the destinies of Europe were in the hands of the famous "Three Boy Kings," Charles V in The Netherlands, Spain and Austria, Francis I in France and Henry VIII in England, known commonly by their sobriquets, "The Silent," "The Dashing Cavalier," and "Handsome Hal." As to wealth Charles and Francis were about evenly matched while Henry trailed in the distance as the poorest.

The Electors of Brandenburg, Saxony and the Palatinate; the bishops of Mainz, Cologne and Treves, and the King of Bohemia constituted the electoral college. Never had seven men in their possession the bestowal of a more keenly sought gift nor were they beset with graver dangers of bribery and corruption. The two leading spirits who knew best how to use their power to its fullest extent were the Hohenzollern brothers, Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg, and Albert, Arch-bishop of Mainz and Halberstadt, and bishop to be of Magdeburg as well as primate of all Germany.

Early in 1517 the campaign began. Maximilian of Habsburg and "Holy Roman Emperor" planned to adopt



Henry VIII of England as his son and heir and to invest him with the sovereignty of Milan, a movement which had the approval of the papacy. The Hohenzollern brothers together with the Elector of the Palatinate and the Bishop of Treves opened negotiations with Francis and pledged him their votes. Immediately upon the receipt of this intelligence Maximilian renounced his former plan and set about to secure the much coveted prize for his grandson who already was ruler of The Netherlands, Spain and the Italian provinces and also heir apparent to the Habsburg dominions, so that only the Imperial Crown was needed to complete the whole.

On the 16th of August, 1518, at the Diet of Augsburg the Hohenzollern brothers informed the French Ambassador that matters looked bad for his monarch; sufficient evidence that they had changed sides with hints that the votes of certain electors might be secured, if the price was forthcoming. Then began the series of offerings and counter offerings of money, marriages, dowries, gifts and favorable positions by the two strong contenders, Charles and Francis, to win the electoral support. Henry VIII of England was too poor to participate in the disgraceful proceedings. "The Margrave, Joachim, costs a good deal, but his avarice is to my grandson's advantage, for through it he will gain his end," wrote Maximilian to the Court of Spain. Thus pledges of support were secured by both parties from all except Richard of Treves and Frederick of Saxony. Richard, however, was secretly pledged to Francis. Frederick alone remained true to the Golden Bull and reserved his decision until the day of election, a procedure which wounded Maximilian deeply, who, however, hoped he would remain true to the House of Habsburg.

On January 12, 1519, when the campaign was at its height occurred the death of Maximilian. Immediately Francis renewed his connivance with the pope for the defeat of Charles by a more lavish use of money. A fresh pack-train of French gold entered Germany to give each elector what he wanted. When remonstrations were di-

rected against him for this procedure he replied, "Your advice would be excellent, if we had to deal with a people who possessed virtue, or even the shadow of it." The Hohenzollerns were the most covetous. Having already received a large quantity of Habsburg gold they now demanded French gold as though they were extorting from barbarian peoples. As to this Francis' only comment was, "I wish the Margrave to be satisfied." "The prodigality with which the French shower propositions, presents and money on the electors is extraordinary," writes Höfler. "This is all-perilous for Germany. I never saw greed to equal that of the electors, who are buying scourges for their own flagellation." Frederick of Saxony bitterly decried this money madness. "Would to God," he writes, "that those who do so would have horns grow on their foreheads so that all men might recognize them. It has got to be the common belief that the election of the Roman Emperor is a question of money. Woe is me, if this be true!" When Albrecht of Mainz, brother of the Hohenzollern Elector of Brandenburg, closed negotiations with the Habsburg agents whereby he made his seventh change, he at once in a most unblushing manner suggested to Henry VIII that his vote might be changed, if he had a sum equal to, or greater than that spent by Charles, viz, 420,000 gold crowns.

This disgraceful traffic received its death-blow rather unexpectedly. The papacy suddenly shifted its support to Frederick of Saxony. This roused the mercantile, industrial and financial men of Germany to action. They announced loyalty to the House of Habsburg and unalterable opposition to the French. The Fuggers of Augsburg came forward with their contribution of 300,000 ducats to the expense fund of the Habsburg claimant and joined with the other bankers in refusing to grant the French credit or sell them exchange. Francis in despair marshalled his troops to assert his claims by force. The German princes likewise mobilized their armies so that by the middle of June Frankfort, where the election was to be held, had the appearance of an



armed camp. When the balloting began Francis realized that his election was impossible and threw his support to Joachim of Brandenburg. As stated above the papacy changed sides and now came out openly and threw its full support to Frederick of Saxony with a pledge of sufficient votes to elect him but he was too wise to be tempted. Frederick's declination made the election of the Habsburger a certainty and on June 24, 1519, the electoral college chose the "Silent Charles" over the "Dashing Cavalier" of France to the wrath of Francis and the disgust of the pope. Francis returned home and at once began preparations for a war with Charles to the finish while the German populace applauded the choice of the electors. Never has an election been held in which money and other propositions were used so openly, freely, shamelessly and shamefully. It cost Charles approximately 1,000,000 gold gulden equal to about 20,000,000 marks of present German money. How much the French and English claimants and the banking and mercantile syndicates spent is uncertain but the amount was equally as large, if not larger. The election marked the triumph of greed, aristocracy and oligarchy.

Charles in a post-election proclamation declared that his aim was to protect and defend Christendom by expelling the Turk and the Moslem from Europe and rooting out the heresy and the revolutionary heretics in North Germany. His self assumed title was, "Perpetual Augmenter of the Empire." His treasury was empty and he was absolutely dependent upon the wealthy bourgeois for the funds necessary to administer the affairs of State. He proceeded to Aix-la-Chapelle, the coronation city, and made his entry there on October 22, 1520, on a horse caparisoned with silver, he himself wearing a silver beretta. On the 23d he was formally crowned "Holy Roman Emperor" and swore to yield due obedience and submission to the Pope and the Holy Catholic Church and promised to support and maintain its institutions which God instituted and exalted as the highest authority on earth. When the coronation festivities were over he

journeyed to Cologne where he issued the summons for a meeting of the German Diet at Worms early in the coming year to consider the religious troubles in North Germany and other vital issues of State. The members assembled in January 1521 and on the 27th the Diet was formally opened with a most impressive service in the cathedral. The vital issues of State engaged its attention for more than two months. In April it reached the religious question and Luther was cited to appear before it. He journeyed thither on a passport of safe conduct and on the 25th made his famous defense and delivered his ultimatum. von Sickingen and von Hutton were encamped with their knights on the hills above the city ready to storm the Diet in case of any injury to Luther or violation of his safe conduct. It was a supreme moment not only for Germany and the Reformation, but also for the whole world. The German people looked upon Luther as the savior of Germany and the leader through whom they would realize improved social and economic conditions. Luther was ready to give his life's blood for the cause he espoused and the welfare of the people whose confidence and loyalty he enjoyed. Charles was keenly conscious as to how much it cost him to secure his election and that his only hope for indemnification for the outlay incurred lay in Germany. Consequently he had not the least desire to participate in any action that would endanger this hope. To violate Luther's passport of safe conduct and lay his hands upon his person meant an immediate revolution in Germany that would cost him his high-priced crown, involve him in financial ruin and expel Catholicism from Germany. He had to choose between revolution and the mandates of the papacy. His economic needs finally overbalanced his solemnly sworn religious obligations and he defied the mandates of Rome to avoid a German revolution. The social and economic forces which in 1517 made the launching of the Reformation possible in 1521 saved it from extinction.

The class which God raised up to replace the useless and decayed knighthood in German society had now



reached the zenith of its power. Prince and prelate were at the mercy of capital and industry. Two things it made real: its motto, "Money has and knows no master," and that, *gain in exchange knows no limits*. Its destructive fruits were luxury, extravagance and corruption. It followed the gods of avarice and vice instead of those of justice and righteousness. How completely and thoroughly it permeated and saturated every phase of human activity in Germany is best seen in the operations of the "Vicious Circle" and the disgraceful vote buying in the election of Charles V. Its constructive fruits were making possible the launching of the Reformation in 1517 and preserving and protecting it in 1521. When, however, the supreme test in German life and society came in the early twenties it failed to support the leader on whom Germany had pinned its faith. Instead of becoming a burden bearer it became a burden imposer. Instead of advancing the landless proletariat and the impoverished handicraftsman socially, religiously and economically it resorted to harsh repressive agencies to prevent them from realizing their natural aspirations to a just and larger share in the tide of social progress.

The peasant disturbances in Europe began in the previous century. This spirit of unrest extended in North Europe from the Carpathians to the Irish Sea. In Germany, France and The Netherlands it attained a degree of intensity far above that in the other countries affected. In Germany the initial movement no doubt was that of Hans Boheim of Nicklashausen who urged the peasants to rise in their might and overthrow the entire fabric of German society. It was crushed before it attained any definite stage. The first organized effort was that of Jacob Wimpfeling in Elsass (Alsace) in 1493. The second came in 1502 and spread over the Middle and Upper Rhine Valley with Untergrünbach as its center. The third occurred in 1512 under the leadership of the famous Josh Fritz with headquarters in the Black Forest. A fourth rising occurred in Baden and South Germany in 1517 the very year in which Luther emerged from pro-

fessorial obscurity in Wittenberg to the leadership in German reform. The banners around which the peasants rallied in these risings were emblazoned with the "Bundschuh," the high laced boot worn by the peasants, and underneath it such mottoes as "Nought but the Justice of God," "Lord, defend thy Divine Justice," and, "Of priests and nobles we have enough and to spare." There exists no evidence to prove conclusively that any degree of co-ordination or concert of action was present in the uprisings. They were the black cumulus clouds on the horizon that precede the coming storm.

The mysterious disappearance of Luther on his return from Worms temporarily deprived the Reformation of its leader. The peasants and the handicraftsmen scented treachery in the councils of the empire. Their ire was kindled against men high in both Church and State. Convinced in their minds that the procedure was an organized conspiracy to deprive them of the fruits of the Reformation, they were eager for an opportunity to avenge the treachery visited upon the leader. When Carlstadt and the Zwickau enthusiasts were driven from Central and Southern Germany they found an asylum in Wittenberg. Their advent was the signal for a violent attack on Luther and his teachings. The enraged proletariat readily responded to their pleas for a radical revolution over against the slow-moving plan of the Lutheran school. Possibilities of a union with the military enthusiasts of the west loomed large and the enthusiasm of the populace transcended all bounds. Impatient of delay and without waiting for preparation or co-ordination with the Wittenberg radicals the militant firebrands in the west launched their military campaign of revenge and reformation by force. A short, sharp disastrous campaign eliminated them. Had Carlstadt and the Zwickau enthusiasts eliminated themselves as quickly and as effectively, a portion of the history of the Reformation would have to be rewritten.

From 1521 to 1524 a campaign of inflammatory discussion and appeal was carried on against the existing secu-



lar and religious order in which racial and social equality was vehemently emphasized. Luther's doctrine of the "Universal priesthood of all believers" was distorted into a black crass individualism of a communistic equality socially and economically. It was forcibly and continually asserted that, "Each individual is a free and fully authorized judge of all those who wish to instruct him and each one is taught inwardly by God alone." The most ignorant peasant was lauded as knowing and understanding the Gospel better than prelates and reformers. Ketterbach declared that, "If the Emperor Charles was as learned as Luther's servant man is, he would not let that stupid monk, his father confessor, Glapion, make such a ninny of him that he is despised the world over and looked upon as a cipher." Everything spoken and published tended to create disorder, destruction and sacrilege. The property of the wealthy clergy must be seized and distributed among the masses as well as that of the rich usurious merchants, importers and trading syndicates and trade with foreign countries be prohibited. The growing taste for luxury and pleasure and the spread of intemperance among nobles, commoners, artisans and peasants must be suppressed and a simple, plain standard of living established and enforced. These teachings, poured into aggrieved ears, furnished the fuel for the flame which burst forth in 1524.

The twelve articles of the peasants' declaration of grievances were exclusively agrarian in character and dealt with their grievances against their overlords lay and ecclesiastical. They were absolutely silent regarding the problems and the ideals of social, economic and political reconstruction that agitated the landless proletariat and the impoverished handicraftsmen of the towns. Like all other movements of that age they embodied a strong infusion of religion and religious sentiment based on the teachings of Christ. At the head stands the declaration that the type of gospel needed is that of the Messiah and that the choosing of a pastor is the act of the people concerned. Then follow the prescriptions relat-

ing to villeinage, the use of woods and streams, the services to be rendered, the reletting of lands, the abolition of unjust and excessive fines and death dues. The object of the propaganda was social reconstruction under a mystical religious garb.

The agitation at first isolated, a few weeks later, burst into a general conflagration that spread like wildfire. Everything appeared to be turned upside down at once with no possibility of any escape from the angry mob. It was deaf to every appeal and absolutely insubordinate to all authority and discipline. From its inception up to the second of May it swept everything before it, save a few noteworthy exceptions. Then disaster followed disaster and by the end of July it was practically crushed. When it began the trained soldiers of the empire were in Italy engaged in the campaign against Francis. On their return after the conclusive victory at Pavia, the revolution was short-lived. Raw peasant levies were helpless before trained fighting men.

The insurrection extended from the Rhine to the Tyrol. It was engendered by conditions everywhere largely the same, though each district had its own history and local color. Treachery, jealousy and petty factional disturbances were its worst enemies. The town proletariat refused to aid the peasant while the peasants of one district refused aid to their brethren in another, even if within easy reach. It was minus any centralized authority or concerted plan of campaign. Time which should have been utilized in training men and fortifying towns and terrain was consumed in feasting and other useless and non-productive activities. Consequently Catholicism and Mediaevalism experienced very little difficulty in throttling social progress.

The year 1525 was a landmark in German society in social, economic, religious and political progress. In it Luther capped his complete repudiation of Catholicism by his marriage to Catharine von Bora, a former nun; Charles V won a complete victory over Francis I and established the full ascendancy of "The Holy Roman Em-



pire" as a German institution; the most widespread and last of the mediaeval peasant uprisings was stamped out; the revolutionary character of the reformation was destroyed and its aristocratic development begun as well as the formulation of the initial steps that led to the Anabaptistic uprising. Catholicism blamed Luther for the convulsions that racked Germany. A certain group of modern writers blame him for deserting the peasants and claim that if he had espoused their cause and assumed direction and control thereof, Catholicism would have been swept away north of the Alps and Germany would not be half Catholic and half Protestant. Our researches in this part of mediaeval and modern history fail to substantiate either of these claims. We found no evidence sufficiently trustworthy and reliable on which a consistent claim could be established. Luther together with his collaborators was engaged in effecting a conservative reformation within the Church by the process of evolution not revolution. During his confinement in the Wartburg a group of misguided enthusiasts who had no patience nor sympathy with any evolutionary program obtained control of matters at Wittenberg and utilized the results attained to foster a revolution along lines for which German society and the German mind was not ready. When he arrived the movement had gained such force and power that control was no longer possible. The only safe, sane and logical course that remained open for him was to dissociate himself and his co-workers therefrom, disavow it and save out of the wreck the best possible. It is true that the reformers possibly did not sufficiently emphasize the social and economic value and use of property, but to espouse the cause in the form it had assumed would have meant a double suicide, self and the work. From the burning structure they saved all that they could and out of that remnant four years later constructed the Augsburg Confession, the best Œcumenical confession which the reformation produced.

Previous to the adoption of the Augsburg Confession none of the religious groups or divisions had any definite

code of teaching, church organization, or church discipline. Each individual was a free and fully authorized judge of all those who sought to instruct him and was taught inwardly by God alone. Since the individual is justified by faith and receives the sacraments on the basis of his faith, then infant baptism is wrong because a child is incapable of making a confession of faith, reasoned the inheritors of the social revolution. The idea of an educated and professionally trained ministry was also rejected. Only "personal enlightened proclaimers of the Kingdom of God" were granted tolerance. To these teachings were added the communistic ideals expounded by Thomas Münzer at Mühlhausen and together they became the bases of the recrudescant social revolution.

Anabaptistic persecution began at Zurich in Switzerland. When Münzer and the Zwickau enthusiasts accepted its tenets Mühlhausen and Augsburg became the chief storm centers. After its suppression in South Germany its advocates made Strasburg the center of their activities. Driven out of Strasburg they migrated to Münster in Westphalia where a new reign of terror was inaugurated in 1533. A communistic state was proclaimed with community of goods and polygamy as the chief cornerstone of its fabric. The Catholic bishop at once laid siege to this citadel of sensuality, brutality, and fanaticism and finally carried it by storm in June 1535. Next it reared its head in The Netherlands and the territory of the Henseatic League. The burghers rose in arms and annihilated it but Lübeck of the League yielded to the propaganda with the result that its final stages became enmeshed with the fall of the Henseatic League.

On April 20, 1533, occurred the death of Frederick, King of Denmark. Since the crown was elective a struggle occurred between the Catholic and the separatistic parties. In May 1534 Lübeck declared war against Denmark and Duke Christian of Holstein. On July 16th of the same year Copenhagen opened its gates to the invaders and all the Danish Islands fell into the hands of Lübeck. The people in the remainder of the country rose in



revolt and the social-political transformation appeared to be complete. In 1535 Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, Lüneberg, Stralsund, Rostock and Weimar all, either members of the Henseatic League, or under its influence, combined to drive out both Catholic and Anabaptist. Duke Christian of Holstein was elected King of Denmark the year previous. In December of that year he reduced the fortress of Aalborg and all of Jutland and in June following defeated the army of Lübeck at Funen. Terms favorable to Lübeck were agreed on in February 1536 between Lübeck and King Christian whereby the League received its death-blow. It lost its political and economic power and significance and its once mighty power rapidly disintegrated. The collapse of Lübeck was also the collapse of the League and at the same time the collapse of the German influence at home and abroad. The commercial precedence which it had always enjoyed passed to the countries of the Western Ocean. With the aid of the Schmalkald League the anti-German party triumphed in Denmark with the result that the Germans lost control also of the Sund and the German Ocean. On August 16, 1536, King Christian entered Copenhagen and suppressed at once the Catholic Church by arresting the bishops and seizing the church property and Denmark became Protestant. With the aid of the nobility he ground down peasant and ecclesiastic alike in slavish bond service as befell Germany everywhere where the social revolution had lifted its head. The social revolution failed because of a lack of cohesion, of unity in action; because of discord in the ranks and the endeavor to establish a communism which the tide of social progress had long ago relegated to the limbo of outworn creeds and theories.

God moves in a mysterious way,  
His wonders to perform;

is nowhere more aptly proven than in the operations of the social and the economic forces of Germany in the making of the reformation. Knighthood reached the

zenith of its power in and performed its great work for humanity during the Crusades in opening the mind of Europe to a world view of men and things. At that time the seeds were planted that came to fruition in the rise of the bourgeois, in the creation of the capitalistic industrial and commercial syndicates, in the development of a world market and a medium of exchange. Henceforth society had no further need of the knight and the lesser nobility and they disappeared slowly from the scenes of human activity. The capitalistic syndicates with their vast accumulations of wealth, the discoveries of new lands and products in the Orient and the Occident and the creation of a worldwide trade prepared the way for the introduction of that extravagance in both Church and State which culminated in the operations of the "Vicious Circle" and the election of Charles V. Its important work in turn was realized when on October 31, 1517, it made possible the planting of the seed of civil and religious freedom and reform at Wittenberg by Martin Luther and its defense and preservation at the Diet of Worms in 1521. With its unprecedented extravagance and corruption it sowed the seeds of its own destruction which fruited first in the great "Peasants' Rebellion" and later in the "Anabaptistic Uprising" with the suppression of which its power passed into the hands of the nations whose shores are washed by the broad Atlantic, while Germany relapsed into the domain of inherited class and caste privilege based on racial inequality and inferiority.

The contributions of the social and economic factors of the reformation must not be left unnoticed. In preparation for and in defense of the reformation as well as in the development of the Augsburg Confession and the freedom of conscience they rendered invaluable service. To this must be added capitalistic industry, world commerce, the principle of democracy, civil liberty and economic freedom. Special privilege and mediaeval feudalistic theories made their development in Germany impossible. Palatine, Huguenot, Pilgrim and Puritan transported them to the western wilderness and there untram-



elled by class and caste in Church and State the first concrete product of real civil and religious liberty, democracy and economic freedom was given to the world in the Declaration of 1776 and the Constitution of 1789. For more than a century America has been giving this product back to Europe with the result that it has now four republics and nine parliamentary monarchies with ministries responsible to the people's representatives. After four centuries of research and study the world of scientific scholarship has not yet measured in full the import and meaning of the magnificent work of Martin Luther in the Sixteenth Century.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VI.

## LUTHER, THE PREACHER.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

Luther was a many-sided man. He had the elements of a universal genius. He was a master in all that he undertook, and his sure fame rests upon no single achievement. As translator and expositor of the Scriptures, as religious reformer, as champion of human rights he clearly excels all men of modern times. In addition, he was incomparably the most notable preacher of his age, and Germany has not since produced his equal. It is questionable whether the Reformation would have succeeded without Luther's constant and powerful preaching.

It is somewhat difficult to estimate the effect of preaching from the printed sermons which survive. The present generation may read unmoved Jonathan Edward's sermon on "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." The sermons of Whitefield stir up no emotions to-day. The speakers with their white-heat convictions, their gestures, their voices tremulous with feeling are absent. The times have changed; the occasions differ. But Luther's sermons may be read with profit after the lapse of four centuries, because there is in them so much of the eternal Gospel. Yet they must be scarcely more than a shadow of what they were in their delivery. Moreover, the sermons as we have them to-day, are in most cases simply reports taken down by friends, and not revised or even seen by their author.

Luther's preaching must be judged by the effect produced upon his hearers, upon the estimate expressed by contemporaries, as well as by his writings in general. The most profound of these might have been preached, so simple, direct and personal are they. Luther was nothing if not a preacher. John Calvin said of him, "Luther



is the trumpet, or rather he is the thunder—he is the lightning which has aroused the world from its lethargy. It is not so much Luther who speaks as God whose lightnings burst from his lips.”

Imagine, if you can, the times in which Luther lived. The morals of the people were low; their ignorance dense. Rome and imperialism dominated. Rome was plying her trade in evil and absurd indulgences. Wealth was in the hands of the few. But a spirit of inquiry was awakening, and men were beginning to question the right of the existing order. Revolution was pending. Into this wilderness came a man crying, “Prepare ye the way of the Lord.” Luther, having by the grace of God seen a great Light, proclaimed with apostolic fervor and assurance the fundamental things of the Gospel. With a vision far clearer than that of “the reformers before the Reformation,” he saw the secret of the world’s undoing in a lack of simple faith in Christ. He saw that the correction of abuses could not remedy the situation, and that a mere reconstruction of the papacy would fail to give the needed relief. Coming to the front with his rich experience and abundant endowment and with the fire of God in his heart, Luther became the mighty preacher of the exceeding sinfulness of sin and of salvation by grace through faith alone.

Facts of this kind must ever be the background of a true estimate of Luther, the preacher. All that he was, that he believed, that he felt, that he experienced, that he knew found expression in his preaching. He was the prophet of his generation. The indefinable essence of his personality like that of all prophets from Moses to Paul he could not transmit to posterity. But we may profitably study and glean, and thus become acquainted with some characteristics of this prince of preachers, and be stimulated to follow his example.

#### I. THE HISTORY OF LUTHER’S PREACHING.

Luther was not “a boy preacher”—that precocious exotic which blooms and dies early. He was a university

graduate and a monk of twenty-two, ripe for his years, when he preached his first sermon before his fellow monks in the refectory of the monastery at Erfurt. About five years later, in 1512, he began his career as preacher in a very humble place and inconspicuous way in a small, dilapidated building in the yard of the monastery at Wittenberg. Here, however, he gave promise of his great future, and in 1515 he was elected as a supply to minister in the large town church. Forty sermons survive from this period, but they fall short of the evangelical standard of his later utterances.

Luther began preaching with great reluctance not simply because of native modesty, but because of a feeling of unfitness for so high a calling. Like Moses, he thought he could not speak to the people. When his best friend and superior, Staupitz, urged him to preach he still hesitated, saying that it was no slight thing to speak to the people in God's stead. As early as 1518 he wrote, "To preach Christ is a hard task and one fraught with the greatest danger. If I had known this in time I should never have become a preacher, but should have said with Moses, 'Send whom thou wilt send,' no one could have induced me to undertake it."

Luther confesses also to a sense of trepidation when he preached before scholarly men like Melanchthon. No doubt he felt thus when called upon to speak, as he often was, without adequate special preparation. It is not apparent, however, that he was seriously embarrassed by the presence of any man. Nevertheless every true preacher sympathizes with Luther when he realizes the greatness of the message and the inadequacy of the messenger.

Luther preached very frequently—as often as four times a day, and after 1529 at least four times a week, and in the aggregate thousands of times. His brief published sermons fill sixteen volumes. He preached on all occasions and wherever he went. His last sermon was delivered only a few days before his death at his birthplace,



Eisleben, whither he had gone to reconcile the counts of Mansfeld.

## II. LUTHER'S QUALIFICATIONS AS PREACHER.

Luther was a richly endowed man. He had a good physical constitution. He, however, broke down under the austerities of his monastic life, his excessive labors, and his acute maladies which the poor medical knowledge of his day failed to remedy. He was built four-square, of medium height, with a broad chest, and with a well-shaped, large head, crowned with short dark curly hair. He had a frank, open countenance, and black eyes, so brilliant that his enemies fancied they saw in them the fire of a demon. His hands were shapely and his gestures graceful. He had a sweet tenor voice which won him bread in boyhood and which gained him attention in manhood. In his early manhood he was emaciated; but later in life under the care of his good Katie and the influence of his joyful faith, his body assumed more generous proportions.

His mental endowments matched his physical equipment. He had a keen intellect, sound, well-balanced judgment and good common sense. He had also a retentive memory, readiness of speech, a glowing imagination, and a fine sense of humor. In tenderness and in courage he was unexcelled. All his natural gifts were consecrated to the high services of God and humanity.

Luther was a good scholar. His Table Talk shows a wide acquaintance with the phenomena of nature and the facts of history. He knew philosophy and patristics. He had studied the school-men. Aristotle, Augustine, and Aquinas were familiar to him. He was a linguist, not indeed like Erasmus or Melanchthon, but a better translator than either. He had the genius to make language. He was an original theologian who furnished the gold which was coined by the formulators.

Luther had a thorough knowledge of the Bible and accepted its message with his whole heart. He was a con-

stant reader and student of the Scriptures, and not only translated them but transmeeted them into the language of the people and interpreted them so that all could understand. His comments remain full of meat to this day.

Moreover, his deep spiritual experience fitted him above all others to become the teacher of his age. He learned to know God, as a reconciled Father through Christ, the Redeemer, as over against the ordinary conception of Him as a stern lawgiver and judge. He had a keen sense of the power of sin in the unregenerate heart. He realized through bitter trial that the soul is saved only through faith in Christ, and not by the deeds of the law. He found in Him the source of unfailing love, joy and assurance. These precious and simple truths were rediscovered and proclaimed by Luther to numberless yearning hearts.

Luther was qualified to reach the common people, because he came from them and was never ashamed of his humble origin. His parents, however, must have been far above the average peasant in intelligence and integrity and independence of character. There is always the touch of reality and life in Luther's preaching. He knew the wants of the people, and he knew how to speak to them in their own language.

There was in Luther, therefore, a rare combination of elements which make for power in the preacher. Few men in any age of the world have been better fitted for leadership than he.

### III. THE SUBJECT MATTER OF LUTHER'S PREACHING.

Luther's sermons were always evangelical. They were drawn from the Bible. Usually they were based on the Pericope or Lesson for the Day. They were doctrinal as well as practical, containing an exposition of a verse or section of Scripture. A firm adherence to the Word was characteristic of Luther. He was wont to say that it was better to give up everything rather than the Word. This does not mean that he blindly accepted the Bible, for he



was not afraid to apply criticism to it in a devout way. His answer at his trial at Worms indicates very fairly his attitude toward the Bible and human reason. He refused to recant unless he were refuted by Scriptural testimonies or by clear arguments. His sermons are a rational and spiritual interpretation of revelation. In this respect they differed very decidedly from the preaching, so-called, of the day. The ordinary sermon of the priests was nothing less than a burlesque, full of idle and improbable tales.

In his preaching Luther emphasized the great themes of the Bible. God was to him not simply Omnipotent Will, as He had been conceived by the great Augustine, but Omnipotent Loving Will. Christ was to Luther the chief theme and content of the Bible, whose individual books were to be tested by their testimony to Him. Luther knew how to proclaim the Law as the way of repentance, and he excelled in his exaltation of justification by faith in Christ as the only way of salvation. All sermons and all congregations were to be tested by their fidelity to this central truth of the Gospel. The acceptance of the message of justification was equivalent to absolution—the assurance of pardon.

Luther's sermons, based on the Bible, were ever true to the needs of the hour, and were replete with comfort for the penitent and with practical directions for holy living.

#### IV. LUTHER'S PREPARATION FOR PREACHING.

Luther's preparation for the pulpit was both general and special. It was, however, the former more than the latter. He wrote few sermons. The present form of them is the work of the reporter, who took them down in short-hand and then expanded them. Luther rarely if ever corrected these reports, and in many cases never saw them in print.

His general preparation consisted in his constant study of the Bible, and his incessant lecturing on its several books, and his ceaseless use of it in his writings and dis-

putations. He read the Bible devotionally every day. This general preparation made it unnecessary to go through the slow and wearisome preparation which most preachers must give to their sermons. He was full of the Bible.

His special preparation consisted in part in the application of the three suggestive words: *Oratio*, *Meditatio*, *Tentatio*. *Prayer* was the habit of Luther's life, and prepared him for *study* or reflection. *Experience* or trial made the Bible real to him. The result of this special preparation appeared in an Outline and a Central Truth. With these in mind and with his heart aglow, Luther spoke without hesitation to his congregations which listened with rapt attention.

#### VI. LUTHER'S IDEA OF A GOOD PREACHER.

Luther is often misquoted and misunderstood. For instance he is said to have outlined the acceptable preacher as follows: (1) He must have a fine pronunciation. (2) He must be learned. (3) He must be eloquent. (4) He must be a handsome person, whom the young ladies will admire. (5) He must not take, but give money. (6) He must tell people what they like to hear.

Luther said this sarcastically of the preacher as the world would have him.

He defines the good preacher thus: He must be (1) orderly, (2) ready of wit, (3) eloquent, (4) gifted with a good voice, (5) must possess a retentive memory, (6) must know when to stop, (7) must be sure of doctrine, (8) willing to stake life, honor and wealth on the Word of God, and (9) willing to be sneered at.

#### V. LUTHER IN THE PULPIT.

The language of Luther's sermons is exceedingly plain and simple. He avoided all abstractions and every appearance of pedantry. He spoke so that the plain peo-



ple and the children could understand him. He once remarked to Major, "A preacher should give the simple folk milk, for every day a new need of first principles arises. One should be diligent with the catechism and serve out only milk, leaving the strong wine of high thoughts for private discussion with the wise. In my sermons I do not think of Bugenhagen, Jonas and Melancthon, for they know as much as I do; so I preach not to them but to my little Lena and Hans and Elsa. It would be a foolish gardner who would attend to one flower to the neglect of the great majority."

Luther's sermons were usually very brief, in which he differed from the later Puritan divines who discoursed by the hour. He speaks sarcastically of his friend, Bugenhagen who was inclined to long preaching. Returning from church one day, he remarked, "Every priest must have his private sacrifices. Therefore Bugenhagen sacrifices his auditors with his long sermons, for we are his victims. He did it finely to-day." Luther's laconic advice to the young preacher is often quoted: *Tritt frisch auf; machs maul auf; hör bald auf*. It may be translated: Step out confidently; speak that you may be heard; be brief. In spite of Luther's great power as a preacher and the brevity of his sermons he at times failed to keep awake his lordship, Elector John the Steadfast. Allowance, however, will be made for the latter when we remember that he was so stout that he was unable to mount his horse unassisted and that a machine had been invented to give him a lift.

Luther's preaching was interesting because it was fresh and practical. He once said "Sermons should be adapted to the occasion and to the audience." Then he cites the case of a minister who preached in an old ladies' home on the blessedness of matrimony and admonished his hearers to get married. Luther's sermons were to the point. They were not discussions or mere historical presentations of ancient facts. He knew how to relate the Gospel to the times. He had a message for the age in which he lived and therefore was sure of a hearing.

But his sermons are never political harangues. If there ever was a time when the preacher must have been tempted to discuss so-called "living issues," it must have been in Luther's day; yet it is always the simple Gospel which he preaches. Here was something higher and deeper than the man-made solutions for the problems of the age. Luther believed that the ills of society came from the neglect of the Gospel and that their cure must be sought in it. His appeal was to heart and conscience. He besought men to repent and to trust Christ and to live holy lives.

The delivery of the sermon was extemporaneous. The idea of reading a sermon from the pulpit probably never entered Luther's mind. His style of delivery was conversational, but animated and rising at times to extraordinary eloquence. There was, however, no declamation or straining after mere effect. Luther was so deeply in earnest and often spoke with such vehemence that he fainted in the pulpit from sheer exhaustion.

Luther was "a born preacher"; he had the endowment which made preaching easy. He had "the idea of preaching"; he knew what was meant by bringing the Word of God home to men though he had too many things to do to allow time for the exact homiletic arrangement of the material and the literary polish of the sermon. There was something primal about him—something that reminds one of rugged towering mountains, of an Alpine peak reaching up to the clouds. Yet he was only a man, and a man of a loving childlike spirit; and he learned to preach by what he suffered, and by constant communion with the Christ whom he loved and adored.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*



## ARTICLE VII.

## THE GENERAL SYNOD AT CHICAGO.

The General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States met in its forty-eighth convention and in the ninety-eighth year of its history in the city of Chicago, June 20-27, 1917.

It was preceded by a most enthusiastic gathering of the Lutheran brotherhoods in the La Salle Hotel on the evening of the 19th, when a thousand men sat down to a banquet, which was followed by a number of inspiring addresses. The next day was taken up by the presentation of great practical problems affecting the life of the Church, culminating in a grand mass-meeting in a theatre where the Reformation thought dominated the addresses. One of the most encouraging signs of the times is the deeper interest and more intelligent activity of the laity. The brotherhoods, the laymen's missionary movement, the Sunday-School, and the Woman's Missionary Society give abundant evidence that the entire Church is responding to the call of the Master as never before in the history of our Church.

The Synod convened in Unity Lutheran Church, whose dedication took place on the Lord's Day, June 24th, at the special request of the Congregation. The act of dedication was performed by the President of Synod, assisted by a number of other ministers. The pastor, the Rev. David A. Davy, his consecrated wife, and the members of the congregation deserve great praise for their achievement in building a fine church edifice, and for the gracious hospitality exercised by them and their fellow Lutherans in Chicago.

The Synod opened in the usual way, the retiring President, Dr. J. A. Singmaster preaching the sermon, which was followed by the Holy Communion. The business of Synod began on Wednesday afternoon, at which time the president read a report of his official acts and of such

other matters as he deemed pertinent to the occasion. This report was an innovation, being the first and only report of a president for nearly a hundred years. The report was kindly received and its several recommendations adopted.

Dr. V. G. A. Tressler of the theological faculty of Wittenberg College—the Hamma Divinity School—was elected president; and Dr. F. P. Manhart of the theological faculty of Susquehanna University was re-elected Secretary, as was also the treasurer, Mr. George H. Knollenberg, of Richmond, Ind.

The reports of the various Boards, Societies and Committees indicated steady and pronounced progress in every department of the Synod's undertakings. The Church Paper Committee reported to the Synod a circulation of over 20,000 weekly. The only lament that was heard, and it was justified, was in regard to the dearth of candidates for the ministry. While the number is somewhat larger than two years ago, it is still far below the needs.

The great world-war was, of course, frequently mentioned; and suitable resolutions passed affirming the Synod's loyalty to the Government in its effort to maintain the nation's honor and to re-establish international law and order in the world.

It is not our purpose to give a detailed account of the proceedings of the General Synod, for these have already been reported in part in the *Church Work and Observer* and will appear in due time in the printed minutes. One great overshadowing event, however, demands particular mention, and is here recorded as an historic landmark. The last item in the report of the retiring president elicited the profoundest interest. Its consideration was reserved for Friday, at which time the commissioners from the General Council and the United Synod in the South were presented to the convention and received with the greatest cordiality. The supreme question of the report and of the day had to do with the union of the



three Lutheran Synods in one great organic body, and was now to come up in an official way for the first time.

The Synod considered the report with the greatest deliberation. Various addresses were made and a number of questions were answered. Amid the deepest solemnity the resolutions were adopted unanimously by a rising vote. The several commissioners from other bodies and the members of the General Synod's Constitution Committee were called upon by the president to make brief addresses. The commissioners especially spoke with deep earnestness, expressive of their hearty sympathy with the action of the Synod. A pentecostal benediction rested upon the assembly as it united in singing, "*Now Thank We All Our God.*"

The action of the Synod can be understood only by reference to the President's Report. The portion pertaining to the union is herewith presented.

#### THE UNION OF GENERAL LUTHERAN BODIES.

The most significant ecclesiastical event in the present year in the history of the Lutheran Church in America is the actual union of several Norwegian Synods in one body with a membership of 300,000 communicants. It is the privilege of the General Synod in the present convention to hasten the consummation of a still larger union by cordially endorsing a projected merger of the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod in the South in one great body with a membership of over 900,000.

These bodies are of common origin, with a similar development and of like faith. For thirty years they have co-operated with each other and have now a common book of worship. They have exchanged delegates and have frequently expressed the most fraternal sentiment. The thin walls which have separated us for the past half century have crumbled, and the pastors and people of the three bodies are on terms of the closest friendship.

It is therefore, not surprising that in this 400th Anni-

versary year of the Reformation there should have arisen a strong, spontaneous and well organized movement for consolidation.

At the meeting of the Joint Quadricentennial Committee held in Philadelphia, April 18th, 1917, the sentiment prevailed that the noblest memorial of the 400th Anniversary would be the merging of the three general bodies represented. Accordingly, the presidents of these bodies, who were present, were requested to form a committee at once for the purpose of formulating a constitution, with an adequate doctrinal basis, and present the same to their respective bodies at their next meetings.

The committee of the General Synod is composed of Drs. Singmaster and Manhart, the President and the Secretary of the General Synod, together with Drs. J. A. Clutz, D. H. Bauslin, E. K. Bell, J. S. Simon, Rev. S. W. Herman, and the Hon. Jno. L. Zimmerman.

The Joint Committee met on several occasions and formulated a Constitution, which is herewith presented and of which a copy is in the hands of each delegate.

For myself and the entire committee I disavow any intention of forcing this constitution on the Church. Nor do we claim any further authority for what has been done than obedience to our own consciences and to what seems to be the demand of the Church. The Constitution is submitted to the sober consideration of this body, whose responsibility in dealing with it as the first of the three bodies is peculiarly important. It seems to me that your attitude toward it will decide, for the immediate future, the fate of the merger.

The proposed union is in entire harmony with the history, genius and avowed design of the General Synod. It was founded for the express purpose of bringing together the Lutheran Synods in this country; and though it has only measurably succeeded in doing this, it has never lost sight of the desired end. Its Constitution declares that "it shall be seriously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in gen-



eral in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interests of the Redeemer's Kingdom may not pass by neglected and unavailing." Moreover, practically all of the district synods embraced in the proposed merger are now or have been in the past constituents of the General Synod.

In regard to the proposed Constitution it should be said that, as far as I can see, there is nothing in its doctrinal basis or its provisions for carrying on the affairs of our Church which is out of harmony with the present Constitution of the General Synod. There are some things in it which may not be necessary or important, but it must be remembered that union in principles generally involves concessions in non-essentials. The experience of our sister bodies may demand certain provisions which do not directly concern us. Moreover, the General Synod has always had a long and detailed Formula of Government, which the other bodies do not have, these facts account for the greater prolixity of the proposed Constitution.

After all, union must start with some clearly outlined basis of belief and of work. It is only a temporary document which can be brought into fullest accord with the needs of a body as they shall arise from time to time.

If a union is to be consummated within the next two years it is evident that none of the constituent synods, can revise the Constitution presented. They cannot adopt it in part. They will have to give absolute assent to it as it now stands. This is not arbitrary, but inheres in the nature of the case. If there be anything radically amiss in the Constitution, it should be rejected as a whole, and the work of reconstruction begun anew.

It should be clearly understood that the proposed merger shall not affect the ownership, character or standing of the Seminaries, Colleges, Academies, or like institutions, which are operating under district charters. Whatever experience may suggest as time goes on will have to be determined by future legislation.

In regard to the method of procedure I venture to propose the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the General Synod hereby approves the proposed Constitution of the United Lutheran Church in America, and authorizes and directs its submission to the District Synods at their next conventions, and heartily recommends its adoption.

2. Resolved, That if at least two-thirds of the district synods of the General Synod shall ratify this Constitution, and if it shall appear that it has been ratified also by the District Synods of the General Council and of the United Synod in the South, then an adjourned meeting of the present Convention of the General Synod shall be convened on the second Tuesday of November, 1918, beginning at 8 P. M., at such a place as shall be determined, and to continue in session for about two days, after which it shall dissolve and merge in The United Lutheran Church in America, whose first Convention shall then and there begin.

If, however, the District Synods of neither the General Council nor the United Synod in the South shall ratify this Constitution, the ratification thereof by the District Synods of the General Synod shall be considered null and void. In view of such a contingency the General Synod shall make provision for its usual biennial convention.

3. Resolved, That, in order to affect the union in accordance with legal requirements, to avoid possible confusion and without destroying in the least the nature and provisions of this Constitution, the following be inserted in "Article V. Delegates" at the conclusion of the first sentence, following the words, "and one lay delegate," viz:

And provided further that the delegates elected by the Synods to the last convention of the general bodies to which they respectively belong held prior to the first convention hereunder, shall be and they are in the adoption hereof chosen by their respective synods as their duly elected delegates to said first convention hereunder, ir-



respective of the basis of representation upon which they were chosen.

4. Resolved, That the President of the General Synod be hereby directed to appoint a committee of eight, of which the President and the Secretary shall be ex officio members, to be known as the *Committee on Ways and Means*, in the event that the Constitution be ratified; or as a *Continuation Committee* in case it be not ratified.

The duties of the Committee on Ways and Means shall embrace the following:

a. To inquire into the legality of the entire matter of union and if necessary employ legal counsel.

b. To be the arbiters to whom all questions shall be referred.

c. To form with similar committees appointed by the other general bodies a Joint Committee on Ways and Means to which must be referred the agreements between the several Boards and Societies for final decision, and which shall arrange and perfect all the details incident to the formation of the union and the holding of the first Convention.

5. Resolved, That the Boards and Societies and other agencies of the General Synod, whose consolidation with similar Boards, Societies and Agencies in the other bodies is contemplated in this union, shall upon its ratification proceed at once to take the needed steps to effect mergers, subject to the approval of the Committee on Ways and Means. They shall pursue a generous course in dealing with the other bodies, but at the same time they shall see to it that the respective interests which they hold in trust receive equitable consideration.

And they are also hereby charged and instructed to carry on their usual work with zeal and without interruption until it can be safely transferred.

Respectfully submitted,

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The proposed Constitution of THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA was approved for submission to the

district synods of the General Synod, and will in all probability receive the same endorsement by the General Council and the United Synod at their next conventions.

We subjoin the Preamble and the Doctrinal Basis.

#### THE PREAMBLE OF THE CONSTITUTION.

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Having been called by the Gospel and made partakers of the grace of God, and, by faith, members of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and, through Him, of one another,

We, members of Evangelical Lutheran congregations in America, associated in Evangelical Lutheran Synods, recognizing our duty as people of God to make the inner unity which we have with one another manifest in the common confession, defense and maintenance of our faith, and in united efforts for the extension of the Kingdom of God at home and abroad; realizing the vastness of the field that God has assigned us for our labors in this Western world, and the greatness of the resources within our beloved Church which are only feebly employed for this purpose; conscious of our need of mutual assistance and encouragement; and relying upon the promise of the divine Word that He who hath begun this work will perfect it until the day of Christ Jesus,

Hereby unite, and now invite and until such end be attained continue to invite all Evangelical Lutheran congregations and synods in America, one with us in the faith, to unite with us, upon the terms of this Constitution, in one general organization, to be known as THE UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

#### THE DOCTRINAL BASIS.

Section 1. The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God, and as the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practice, ac-



according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

Section 2. The United Lutheran Church in America accepts the three ecumenical creeds: namely, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, as important testimonies drawn from the Holy Scriptures, and rejects all errors which they condemn.

Section 3. The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, founded upon the Word of God; and acknowledges all churches that sincerely hold and faithfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession to be entitled to the name of Evangelical Lutheran.

Section 4. The United Lutheran Church in America recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalkald Articles, the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord, as in the harmony of one and the same pure Scriptural faith.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## THE NORWEGIAN LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

"The Norwegian Lutheran Church in America" came into organic existence on June 9th, 1917, at St. Paul, Minnesota, by the union of three Norwegian synods,—the Hauge, the Norwegian and the United Norwegian. The new organization numbers 294,026 confirmed members, 1257 ministers, and 2926 churches, with property valued at \$5,400,000. There are about twenty-eight institutions of learning and a large number of institutions of mercy. Its foreign mission fields are in China, Madagascar, Africa and Alaska. The general body will meet triennially, and the district synods annually.

The first American Norwegian minister was Elling Eielsen who was ordained on October 3, 1843. He had emigrated about 1840 from Norway and was a follower of Hauge, who though a layman had revived evangelical preaching in the home-land. Eielsen formed the first Norwegian synod in April 1846, known as the Hauge's Synod, which held its seventy-second and last synodical convention at St. Paul, in June prior to the merger. Though the oldest of the three bodies it was the smallest, numbering only 22,000 confirmed members.

The Synod of the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church of America was organized in Wisconsin in 1853 by seven ministers who served about forty congregations. In 1872 the Synod took part in the organization of the Synodical Conference, but withdrew eleven years later as the result of a violent controversy on the question of predestination, the chief disputants being Professor Schmidt of the Norwegians and Professor Walther of the Missouri Synod. In 1890 Schmidt withdrew and with others formed the United Norwegian Lutheran Church. At the



time of the merger the Synod of the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church numbered 447 ministers, 986 churches, and 97,586 confirmed members. In spite of its varied troubles it closed its separate career with credit, after sixty-four years of earnest work.

The United Norwegian Lutheran Church was the youngest and yet the largest of the three bodies in the merger consummated in June. It consisted of 650 ministers, 1650 congregations, and 173,534 confirmed members at its twenty-eighth and last convention. It had been formed by three bodies; the Norwegian Conference, the Augustana Norwegian Synod, and the Anti-Missouri Brotherhood. At its final meeting it was reported that all the departments of the Church were in a flourishing condition. Over \$152,000 was contributed to Foreign Missions during 1916. The Pastor's Annuity Fund amounts to over \$135,000, the cost of the administration of which is only five and one-half per cent. of the income. Other interests make an equally good showing.

The Norwegian Lutheran Church in America is the outgrowth of discussions and negotiations begun a dozen years ago. The real cause of the merger lies in the unity of a simple evangelical faith which had existed all the time, but was hindered in its external realization by various outward conditions and perhaps a few internal aberrations. Moreover, its constituents are closely bound to one another by racial and linguistic ties. The mother-tongue, however, is slowly but surely yielding to English, in which language about one-third of its services are now being conducted. Let us hope that the Norwegian Lutheran Free Church, with its 185 ministers and 29,000 members, and the little Eilson Synod with its 5 ministers and 1,100 members, will join the newly formed Norwegian Lutheran Church in America; and also that a union with their kindred, the Danes will not be long delayed.

The following account of the First Convention of The Norwegian Lutheran Church of America is taken from the first number of the *Lutheran Church Herald*, which

is a continuation of the *Lutheran Herald* and the *United Lutheran*.

The three united synods met at the armory and marched thence to the auditorium. Hauge Synod led the march with Governor Peter Norbeck of South Dakota and his father, the venerable Rev. G. Norbeck, as color bearers. Next in order came the members of the Norwegian Synod with Mr. Berg of Galesville as color bearer. Last came the members of the United Church with Mr. Oley Nelson and Rev. N. E. Boe, two Civil War veterans, as color bearers. The order of march was as follows: Officers of the United Church, The Theological Faculty, Board of Trustees, editors of the church papers, managers of institutions, officers of the Young People's League, pioneer pastors, other pastors, and lay delegates.

The following report of the exercises on Saturday morning was written by Rev. Gustav Stearns of Milwaukee for one of the city papers.

"The greatest church demonstration ever held by Norwegians and those of Norwegian descent in the world, not excluding Norway, was held in St. Paul to-day.

The occasion was the uniting of three branches of the Norwegian Lutheran Church which have been severed for twenty-seven years.

Nearly 15,000 persons endeavored to enter the St. Paul Auditorium to take part. The exercises were to open in the Auditorium at 10 A. M. At 9.30 the doors were locked except to the pastors and official delegates, who were in a parade from the Armory.

When the Auditorium was reached the sight which greeted the marchers was inspiring from a patriotic, religious and musical standpoint.

In front of them just above the stage were two huge American flags. Beneath the flags was the great jubilee chorus of approximately 2,000 voices, composed of young people in church choirs from all parts of the country. To the right, below the stage was the famous Luther College concert band of 60 instruments from Decorah, Iowa,



which is known in all parts of this country and Norway. Prof. Carlo A. Sparati is director of this band.

The galleries were filled and many were standing. Ten minutes before the appointed time everything was in readiness for the beginning of the epoch-making program. The vast audience, led by the jubilee chorus and accompanied by the Luther College band, arose and sang the *Te Deum* in Norwegian, "We Praise Thee, O Lord."

The audience remained standing while the Rt. Rev. T. H. Dahl, D.D., who for fifteen years has been president of the largest of the three united bodies, read Psalm 130. After this the Rt. Rev. H. G. Stub, D.D., offered a prayer. He prayed not only for God's blessing on the union which was about to take place, but he prayed also for God's blessing upon this united nation, which is now engaged in a great conflict.

After the prayer the entire audience remained standing and repeated in unison the Apostles' Creed and Lord's Prayer. Rev. J. J. Ekse, of the Hauge Synod, led this part of the service. This was followed with an address by the Right Rev. C. J. Eastvold, representing the Hauge Synod. He chose as his text Psalm 118, verse 26: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. We bless you from the House of the Lord."

The Rt. Rev. H. G. Stub, D.D., president of the Norwegian Synod, selected as his text Psalm 126. In an eloquent manner he compared the present occasion and the pilgrimage of to-day on the streets of St. Paul with the pilgrimage of the children of Israel, when they returned from their captivity in Babylon. He said in part:

" 'Great things hath the Lord done for us, and therefore we rejoice.' Many are to-day asking themselves the question: 'Is this that we are experiencing here to-day real or is it only a dream?' For many years we were engaged in a battle against each other. It was a hard battle, but it was an honorable battle. Some of us believe that we were in the right and we defended that position. We had a right to do that. It was the only honorable thing we could do, but the Lord has shown us that the

others of us were also in the right, and now we are able to realize that we are confessing the same thing. It would be a sin to remain apart."

Rev. Mr. Dahl selected as his text Psalm 118, "This is the Day the Lord Hath Made, Let Us Rejoice in It." He said in part: "We gather here around the cross of Jesus. The purpose of this union not only is to form a large outward organization, but it is to do work in the vineyard of the Lord. We are to march forward and plant the cross of Jesus in as many places as possible, even in the distant kingdoms of the world."

After the addresses Rev. Mr. Eastvold moved Dr. Dahl as temporary chairman. He was elected by the convention unanimously. Prof. M. O. Wee of the Hauge Synod was elected temporary secretary.

At this point Dr. Dahl called on Governor J. A. A. Burnquist. There was a great demonstration as the Governor arose to speak. The three color guards commenced waving the flag. Dr. Dahl called attention to the fact that no applause is permitted at these church conventions, but he smilingly remarked that of course we must make an exception to our civil authorities. The audience again commenced to applaud.

In his address, Governor Burnquist called attention to the separation of the Church and the State, but he also explained that in many respects these two were not separated. "Our constitutions acknowledged a power higher than the power of man," he said. "James Russell Lowell said the nation would endure so long as the ideals of its founders remained predominant. It is upon the religion of the people that the laws depend."

Dr. Dahl then called T. D. O'Brien, president of the Saint Paul Association, who represented the Mayor. "St. Paul is a Christian city," he said. "More than 200 churches have spires pointing toward the heavens. Our seminaries, colleges and schools, including your own, are numerous. We are glad to welcome you. We are glad to see that you are so patriotic. We noticed that there was only one nation's flag in your possession."



Dr. Dahl thanked the Governor and Mr. O'Brien for their words of welcome and congratulation.

Rev. J. C. Roseland introduced the following patriotic resolution, which was adopted amid a great demonstration:

"Inasmuch as our Nation has been drawn into this regrettable world war, and inasmuch as our government has appealed to all our citizens to give it our loyal support in this our national crisis, and inasmuch as the constituency of this convention is chiefly of foreign extraction and of the Lutheran faith; therefore be it hereby

Resolved by this gathering of approximately 10,000 to 15,000 Norwegian Lutherans from the various States of the Union, in convention assembled at the St. Paul Auditorium, St. Paul, Minn., that we most cordially pledge the President of the United States and the Government our most loyal support, praying that the God of Nations may guide them with His counsel and grant our Nation a happy issue out of this deplorable conflict."

Several telegrams from all parts of the country and several cablegrams from Norway, expressing congratulations were read. Those which created greatest interest were a cablegram signed by all of the bishops of Norway, another from the minister of the Church Department in the cabinet of the King, and a telegram from the Minister of Norway at Washington.

Without any unseemly boasting but with profound thankfulness to God it can be said that Saturday, June 9, 1917, was the greatest day in the history of the Norwegian-Americans, it was the greatest day in the history of the Lutheran Church in America, and it certainly was one of the greatest days in the history of the Lutheran Church in the world. And the vast audience present was very conscious that this was an occasion the like of which they would never live to see again.

Rev. J. C. Roseland read to the audience the letters, telegrams, and cablegrams of greeting and congratulation received.

## ARTICLE IX.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

Dr. Henry E. Jacobs of Mt. Airy Theological Seminary writes of "The Church and the Churches" in the *Constructive Quarterly* (June) as follows:

The problem, it must be acknowledged, meets us to-day in a somewhat different form from that in which it was pondered by our fathers centuries ago and under other conditions. The world has shrunk into comparatively narrow limits. The reign of provincialism and insularity is over. The increased facilities for travel introduced in modern times, and the rapidity with which information is diffused, bring nations and people and all the forces of intellectual, social and religious life throughout the world into touch with one another. The different types of Christianity meet not only in the missionfield in their common efforts to convert the world to Christ, but in new lands such as ours where the population is composite. Representatives not only of different nations, but of different ecclesiastical bodies that are widely separated in the Old World, are here found dwelling side by side. Their agreements and differences come to light as they cannot in their former homes. As the people of whom the historical Churches are composed grow farther and farther distant from the lands whence they have brought their particular forms of religious life, is it possible for denominational lines to be perpetuated in America indefinitely? Must not that which is provincial—and therefore of human origin and authority—fall off, and that which is divine, the pure preaching of the Word and the right administration of the sacraments alone abide, as the true basis of Church Union as well as the true test of the Church? Must not this inevitably result, as the religious life with its sense of the fellowship of all



true believers deepens, and rational and national ties of a former period recede farther and farther into the dim distance? Under such conditions must not that which is purely accidental disappear while only that which is essential remains?

Nevertheless, even if such suggestions be realized, is it not too much to expect that this growing unity will necessarily be expressed in one compact, thoroughly articulated organization? Even without a centralized government, is it not possible for Christians of the same or of diverse nationalities to rejoice in the evidences of the common faith that appears? Are not appeals made to the heart more potent than those which are enforced by external constraint? Is not love more effectual than the most minute code of laws? Is there any form of officialism comparable in influence to that of the possession of a common motive and a common aim? No attempt assuredly is useless that looks to the removal of misunderstandings or causes of offense among those who claim to be followers of the same Master.

We cannot more appropriately close this paper than in the language of the Formula of Concord—the last and most explicit of the Lutheran Confessions of the Sixteenth Century: “For that unity we entertain heartfelt pleasure and love, and this, on our part, we are sincerely inclined and anxious to advance according to our utmost power, by which His glory remains to God uninjured, nothing of the divine truth of the Holy Gospel is surrendered, no place is admitted for the least error, poor sinners are brought to true, genuine repentance, encouraged by faith, confirmed in new obedience, and thus justified and eternally saved alone through the sole merit of Christ.”

“May Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, grant the grace of the Holy Spirit, that we all may be one in Him, and constantly abide in that Christian unity which is well pleasing in His sight. Amen.”

---

In the same number of the *Constructive Quarterly* Dr.

Peter Ainslie discusses "The Righteousness of Unity." We quote the following:

The various communions have done well. They have done their best, but it is absolutely impossible for any communion in Christendom to either conquer the world or to produce the best type of Christianity that the world is capable of producing. It is contrary to the laws of nature and religion. Comity must succeed rivalry, co-operation must succeed competition, and love must be the distinctive peculiarity of Christianity before either the final move is made for the world conquest or the best flower of Christian faith is produced on earth. Neither Greek Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism nor Protestantism can last as they are now. All of these divisions have in themselves the prophecy of death, but love and help and government and freedom and kindness are as immortal as God. For one communion to join another, or for a dozen communions to federate together, is not the solution of this problem. Such federations help. Not until we who believe in Jesus are willing to be lifted out of the realm of formal Christianity and make our abiding in the activities of vital Christianity, where faith in Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God and love for all mankind become the denominating principles of life, will the world be convinced that Jesus is the Christ.

The union of believers is common sense. They believe in the same God, the same Christ, the same Holy Spirit; they read the same Bible and hold sacred the same day and urge the same holiness. Then how absurd to mar this common faith and common service by separating the forces into unsympathetic communions and practicing an unbrotherliness that the whole world sees from Hongkong and Calcutta to London and New York. Five communions enter a little town with a thousand people and work independently of each other and frequently are more hostile against each other than against the works of iniquity. Five hundred ministers are working in a city of half a million people, and largely the only co-operation is that between those who bear the same denominational name,



and each of these groups is working as though there were no other workers in town, and sometimes overlapping each other's fields as freely as though the others were congregations of pagans. It is not simply an extravagant use of energy and money, but it is a powerful assault upon one of the fundamental principles of Christianity, which is the brotherhood of believers. Of all the instances of business sagacity, denominational Christendom presents to-day the most ridiculous program of any institution upon the face of the earth, so that it may well be said, "The sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of light."

Some believe that their communion will swallow up all other communions and so are contented with this state of affairs, urging the continuance of the separation of brethren because of this vain and sectarian hope. We must be patient, however. It must not be forgotten that such a position is as unreasonable as to advocate the practicing of the opposites of the ten commandments, for division in the House of God is immorality. The way to a united Christendom is clearing up. Thousands in all communions are anxiously desiring it, and out of the consciousness of its necessity no one communion may lead us, lest that communion fall by its pride, but Christ in various communions shall be the Leader of us all.

Forms and ceremonies are not religion, but belong in the realm of formal Christianity and are governed frequently by tastes and traditions and have no more right to separate brethren than the choice of food on the table has to break up the peace of a family. Theologies are not religion, for they change with the centuries in their attempt to explain religion, and have no more right to separate brethren than theories of commerce have to break up human friendship. One argues that baptism is the great barrier to a united Christendom, but this is not true, for the various families of immersionists are no closer together than the various families of pedobaptists. Another contends that the historic episcopate is the chief barrier, but this is not true, for a distinguished prelate of

that communion, the late bishop of Albany, said, "Because we are convinced of the validity of our orders in the apostolic line, we are not called upon to doubt or deny the validity, whatever may be the irregularity, of any sort of ordination. If validity means anything, it means power to accomplish an end; and with the abundant results of such ministeries, which are quite apart and separate from our own, it seems to me that only a blind man or a maniac can question their validity."

The solution lies not in our theories nor in our compromises, but in such a return to the beliefs and practices of the New Testament Church that faith in Jesus and love among believers will come as refreshing as a warm April day after the damp, cold winds of March. "This is His commandment, that we should believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another." The world's hope is grounded in this and it will come as surely as the tides come in the sea or the stars come in the sky.

---

Professor Andrew Gillies, of Boston University, writes interestingly in the *Methodist Review* (Mch.-Apr.) on "A Day with My Old Sermons." There is food for reflection for preachers in this article.

In an address before the New York Conference some years ago Lyman Abbott said: "The wonder to me is not that so few people go to church, but that so many go." The grim humor of that remark never dawned upon my darkened intellect until that day spent in re-reading my old sermons. Not because they fell far short of literary excellence! Everybody knows that literary polish in the pulpit is a rare and perilous accomplishment. Methodists especially are more particular about the meal being hot than they are about having it served on Haviland china. It was not their literary shortcomings that caused depression, it was their homiletical. How easy it was to distinguish the different periods of ministerial hero worship. I suppose that ought not to have surprised me. If Robert Louis Stevenson, "to whom style was a matter of life and death," must needs make the confession, "I have



played the sedulous ape to Hazlitt, to Lamb, to Wordsworth, to Sir Thomas Browne, to Defoe, to Hawthorne, to Montaigne, to Baudelaire, and Obermann," it is not at all strange that a young preacher succumb for a time to the influence of Brooks or Beecher, Robertson or Drummond. Some of the sermons reminded me too forcibly of a famous editorial in the *New York Sun*, published soon after the metropolitan advent of the widely heralded preacher, Dr. ———. The editorial ran something like this: "Judging by the sermonic samples given out thus far, we feel safe in affirming that the pulpit of ——— Church has entered upon an era of quotations." Some were at fault, not so much in what was said as in the matter of the saying. Enthusiastic youth, exultant over recent discoveries in the theological world, is prone to failure in appreciation of and reverence for the "faith of the fathers," and many a young preacher thinks the saints are being fed the bread of life when they are only pelted with chunks of half-baked, indigestible dough. Some of those sermons failed because they were not sermons at all. I wonder if you know what I mean. A while ago I went to hear a man, and when he had finished I felt that I had listened to an address on military science when what my soul craved and needed was a call to arms. He was telling how it ought to be done when he should have been doing it. The same thing has impressed me as I have listened to other men, and the same thing impressed me as I read some of my own. It was the spirit of our time however, as mirrored in those manuscripts that disturbed me the most. Shailer Mathews says that the modern church suffers from attempting too many things. Billy Sunday says that Christian people have gone daffy over social service. Dr. Watkinson, when asked to account for the continued slump in the membership of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, declared that it was due to the preaching of politics in the pulpit and absorption in socialistic themes. How those sayings came back to me as I looked over the sermonic output of several years. There were too many on Moral Reform, and Civic Right-

eousness, and Industrial Democracy, and The Function of the Church, and too few on Redemption from Sin by Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. There was too much about Christian activities and too little about the culture of the soul. There was a maximum about what we ought to be doing for our fellow men and a minimum about what Christ did for us and seeks to do in us through the Holy Spirit. There was a plethora of sermons on benevolence and justice and honesty and a paucity of sermons on the sinfulness of sin, the need of repentance, the atoning blood of Christ and the high privileges of suffering for Him. And it did not do a particle of good to say, "Most of it was forced upon me. Tuberculosis Sunday and Child-Labor Sunday and all the other Sundays set aside for specific themes together with the zeitgeist have caused this lack of homiletical balance." My miserable Scotch conscience would answer back, "The true minister should reflect, not the spirit of the time but the spirit of the eternal. In such a period he should give himself the more completely to affirming that we are saved for service, but we cannot be saved by service. His primary function is not to re-echo the thunders of the Hebrew prophets, but to exalt and persuade men to accept a crucified Redeemer."

---

*The Magazin fuer evan-luth. Homiletik* (July) contains an address delivered at the dedication of a Parochial school building by Louis Dorn in which he justifies the parochial school system. He says in part:

We have in our country a splendid system of public schools. They are doing a great and admirable work. The instruction offered by them is excellent. They are able to train the minds of the children for their future work in life. They may lead them into the paths of civic righteousness; for there is a certain conventional morality which may be taught and practiced without a specifically Christian education. We know that even the heathen has some conception of duty. Such a conventional morality and such a sense of duty may be instilled in the state-



schools without the teaching of religion. We fully appreciate the necessity and the good work of the state-school; we are willing to pay our taxes for its support; we gladly unite with our fellow-citizens in every effort that has for its purpose the improvement of these institutions. But with us the paramount question regarding the public school is, Can it give religious instruction? Can it give religious training to our children? Our children need constant, uninterrupted religious instruction and training,—can we ever hope to get this through the medium of the state-school? Let us seek a plain answer to this question.

And now let us apply this principle to the public school. The public school is undoubtedly an organ of the State. It is the State which teaches and educates the children in the public schools through its officers, through the teachers. The State itself teaches whatever the school teaches by order of the State. It is evident that, if religion were to be taught in our public schools by order of the State in obedience to some law,—I say it is evident that in such a case the State would teach that religion. The State would give religious instruction. In other words, the separation of Church and State would cease to exist, the religion taught in the public schools would be a State-religion. It must be clear to every thinking American that the public school can never take over the religious instruction and training of our children; every step taken in that direction is a grave menace undermining that most precious part of our liberties, the liberty of religion.

And now let us think! Let us not be afraid to form a conclusion! We know that our children must have interrupted religious training and teaching, and we know that this never can be furnished by the public school without violating the principle of complete separation of Church and State. What, then, remains to be done? We can follow the command of God to bring up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord in no better way than by establishing and maintaining Christian parochial schools. In doing this, we manage to give our

children what they need in such a manner that the great principle of religious liberty is not endangered. We seek the peace of the city, the welfare of the State, by avoiding the confounding of Church and State. We seek to satisfy our Christian conscience without attacking the bulwark of American liberty. We prepare our children for the life to come, and, at the same time, seek to uphold the fundamental principles of our governmental system. We aim to be good Christians and good Americans at the same time.

---

“Ministers and Human Life” is the subject of a very sensible and practical address by Dr. J. Spangler Kieffer of Hagerstown, Md., published in *The Reformed Church Review* (Apr.) We quote in part:

Especially will the minister have little to say, and nothing at all to say in the way of explanation or apology, as regards his sermons. It would be a good rule for the minister to follow, never, under any circumstances, directly or indirectly, publicly or privately, in the pulpit or out of the pulpit, to make an apology for any sermon preached by him, however poor that sermon may have been. Let him preach the Gospel to the best of his ability; let him make diligent preparation for so doing; let him magnify his office as a preacher; let him not permit his activities as a pastor, important as they are, to interfere with his duty as a preacher; let him consider that there are shortcomings in regard to other matters which a people will more readily forgive than they will forgive habitual shortcomings in regard to the matter of preaching. With all this, it is probable that he will preach many a sermon that might be called “poor.” Indeed, it is safe to say that he will never preach a sermon that does not in some measure fall short of what he desired and intended it to be. For the poverty of his poor sermons a sufficient explanation might perhaps sometimes be given. The minister will occasionally have to preach under difficult circumstances; will sometimes preach when his time for preparation has been almost entirely



taken from him; will sometimes preach when he can hardly stand on his feet to do so; will perhaps sometimes preach when his heart is almost breaking. But why should others know it; why speak of it; why make any explanation or apology; why treat his sermon as if it were a theatrical or literary performance, creditable or not creditable to himself personally? The preacher is not a performer; he is a herald, an ambassador of the great King of righteousness and truth and love; his sermon is not a performance; it is a message. Let him deliver it as well as he is able; but let him not treat it as a performance by making any apology for it or giving any explanation in regard to it. In his preaching the preacher is far beyond the region in which explanations and apologies are proper. Our Saviour said, "My kingdom is not of this world." In some sense, all the things pertaining to this kingdom are, in like manner, "not of the world." Here we are in a strange world; we are in the native land of paradoxes and enigmas. Here the worst may be the best, and the best the worst. The sermon which is poor, when judged from a literary and theatrical point of view, and which, because of its halting character, brings mortification to the preacher of it, and is not likely to be praised by any of the hearers of it, may be the very sermon which God, whose way it is to choose "the foolish things of the world to confound the wise," and "the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty," has chosen to make manifest the power of His Word and of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The sermon whose rhetoric is the poorest may be the very sermon to awaken the conscience of some hearer, or to reach and touch the heart of some poor sinner.

---

Dr. H. M. Du Bose, editor of *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Nashville, Tenn., contributes an article on "The Future of Methodism" to the *Methodist Review* (May-June). There are some wholesome suggestions in it for all churches.

The centripetal of history is toward unity; the world of

government feels it; science echoes it; secular thought affirms it, and social movements answer it. Disobedience to the mandate of history is nearly the same as disobedience to the first of the commandments. With the world about it the Church has often disregarded the monitory voice, and always to her confusion. Rome would not see the significance of Protestantism; the High Churchmen of England would not see the relevancy of the Wesleyan revival; nor did modern Non-Conformist England see that William Booth was a man sent from God until the Salvation Army came and shamed all Christendom with a living realization of the parables of the lost sheep and the good Samaritan. The modern Church has had its warning. An age of marked political and social phenomena will need a gospel of marked power matched to an ecclesiasticism which follows the lines of living fellowship and universal sympathy. Let Methodism ask herself if these possibilities inhere in her plans and the interrelations of her parts. There are ecclesiasticisms which by these tokens are doomed, not wholly because of their realistic and hierarchial incubi, but because they have no power to see and read the tokens of the future.

Large sections of Methodism are suffering through blind allegiance to conditions which the age and the country have out-lived. Men and women are paying a price and a penalty—the price and penalty of narrowed spiritual and social opportunities—when there is in the devotion no merit or ground of self-approval. It is not as in the days when the Vaudois and the Huguenots paid such a price for liberty of conscience; it is a demand for sacrifice to be made in the name of traditional conditions that should be amenable to judgment and fraternity. In the guilt of imposing these outworn conditions all Methodism shares alike. The sin of maintaining a border in the heart of a great united country long ago ceased to be venial. What may have been necessary and legal in the days of war and their aftermath is in the times of peace an intolerable obsolescence. The effort of one party or the other to cross that border is to open the door of a



closed sepulchre and to compound a past offense. Neither partisan overtness nor cordial compromise can remedy the case. Federation is as impossible as is a correction of the tides. The path of unification is the only way into Methodism's future of largeness and salvation.

---

"The Future of Lutheranism" is discussed by Prof. J. L. Neve in the *Lutheran Church Review* (Apr.), closing with the following pertinent paragraphs:

When we consider the hampered condition of the Lutheran State Churches in Europe, and then observe the development of the Lutheran Church in America, we cannot help but feel that for the present at least the Lutheran Church of our country is the main hope for the preservation and propagation of historic Lutheranism. There is a great responsibility upon us. The question may be in place: Are we prepared to lead in solving the problems with which the Lutheran Church of this age is confronted? Our efforts, in literary respects, have been occupied almost exclusively with investigating the Reformed age and its literature for the purpose of discovering the lessons for an historic Lutheranism under these new surroundings and for solving problems rising from the observation of trends and tendencies in the surrounding denominations. But we Lutherans in America, in our isolation from the movements of theological liberalism, have missed the schooling which the champions of a positive faith in the European State Churches have been receiving from their vivid contact with modern theology in all its shades. The time has come when we should make all efforts to thoroughly familiarize ourselves with all the essential issues of the controversy on the Scriptures, so that we can take an intelligent part, especially also by contributing to the literature on the subject. Called upon to serve as a bulwark of historic Lutheranism, we must prepare ourselves to lead also in this greatest of all struggles in which the Church of Christ has become involved.

There are many more matters that might be touched upon in discussing the future of Lutheranism. But

space forbids to include more. Let me say in closing: Lutheranism, born under the hammer strokes upon the door at Wittenberg in 1517, fostered into the full strength by the great Luther, with the aid of Melanchthon, until in 1530 it sailed as an established Church under its own colors; fortified in its historic position in 1580 with the Book of Concord: this Lutheranism represents a Church that will stay because of the inherent vitality of its Scriptural principles.

---

In the same number of the *Review*, Dr. J. A. W. Haas, President of Muhlenberg College, in an article, "A Plea of Pessimism" presents the alternative between religion and pessimism very strongly:

Civilization has broken down. In its great problems moral considerations do not obtain. Governments have drawn the last conclusions of a bankrupt civilization. They are moved by racial jealousies, by suspicions, by lust of power and by insincere commercialism. Armies and navies give occasion for aggrandizement. The iron fist is over all, and there is no consideration of justice through the control of power. No power of religion has been able to stay the breakdown of the moral forces of the world. We have succumbed to cunning, duplicity, insincerity, lying, brutality and inhumanity. No claims of religion can cover up the evident symptoms of the carcass of humanity which smells to heaven and calls for the eagles of judgment.

Why cannot religion stay this decay? Why can it not save mankind? Because we are not willing to be sincerely and thoroughly religious. They may be formally religious and indulge themselves in ancient terms, which have no meaning and force to-day, or they may be broad and liberal and, therefore, lost to the sense of mystery and awe. The sober calculation of chances for the external and material have killed the spiritual. This need not surprise us, for did not the Christ who founded a salvation for all the world, and who wanted all men to be saved, never deceive himself about the outcome? He knew and



taught that many are called and few are chosen. The multitude travel on the broad way that leads to destruction. No one has more earnestly spoken of hell than Jesus Christ. He emphasized the fact that for many their worm shall not die and their fire shall not be quenched. Men are to be cast into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Dives is in torment, and Judas Iscariot cannot be rescued, for he is the child of perdition. If the most optimistic religion despairs of man, what claim have we the right to make? Our only escape is to eliminate the words of Jesus and make the Gospels a rope of sand. We can only remain optimistic by denying the authenticity of the words of Jesus. But if these are gone, all religious authority has departed. We no longer grant authority to the book. We do not accept the organization. If, then, finally the authority of the message is gone, we are left without any authority, religion is adrift and optimism is a pure speculation. We are hastening through our modern liberalism into conditions of religious dissolution which no sentimentalist can deny. We are nearer Shaw than Noyes. It is only through effort which is futile that we make ourselves believe that Noyes is right; but facts show and tendencies teach us that the pessimism of Ibsen is truer to our real condition and state than all the optimism of Browning.

---

Rev. W. E. Henry, of Everett, Washington, contrasts "Apostolic and Present Day Preaching" in an article in the *Review and Expositor* (Apr.)

Luther's cardinal doctrine was justification by faith alone. Neither works nor the Church could avail anything in securing salvation. Eternal life came by faith in Jesus Christ. The faith that saved found its centre in a Christ who died, but not in a dead Christ. "The revelation of God for the salvation of the soul he found in Christ, the historical but ever-living Saviour, and he could find certainty of salvation only by venturing upon Him, by a personal appropriation of His merits by faith." Zwingli and Melanchthon shared with Luther this same

intensified interest in the Christ, and Calvin is declared by one with no special sympathy with his system to be "the first theologian, since the days of Greek theology, to bring out the spirit that was in Christ." Thus the risen Saviour began again to be admitted to His proper place in human thought, and man's life began again to be lifted out of the depths.

Still another striking manifestation of the power of the preaching of the resurrection is seen in the developments of the eighteenth century. This was the era of that great "revolt against revealed religion" called Deism. According to the deists God dwells apart from the world. Having set it going, He has left it to go on as it will. Nature speaks of Him, but the idea that He became incarnate and entered into the world system historically cannot be entertained. But deism did not live out the century. Its agitation called forth a counter agitation. Not only was the folly of the reasoning upon which it was based presented in a matchless way in Butler's "Analogy," but the divinity of our Lord was vindicated afresh, and the evidence for His resurrection was restated and emphasized in a marked way. And this emphasis upon the risen Christ in the literature of the period was mightily complemented by a living demonstration of spirit and power in the Methodist movement which sprang up in 1739. The very air became "vocal, as it were, with the praises of a risen Saviour," and Deism could not live in such an atmosphere. Like the errors of earlier ages it added its dying testimony to the power of the preaching of the resurrection—a power which we may well believe the world has yet to see made manifest in all its fullness.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*



## ARTICLE X.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE ABINGTON PRESS. 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY.  
*Religious Experience; Its Evidential Value.* By George  
Preston Mains. 8vo. Pp. 272. Cloth, gold top.  
Price \$1.25 net.

This volume belongs to the sphere of Apologetics, or of Christian Evidences. It is an earnest plea for the truth and divine origin of Christianity based on the testimony of Christian experience.

The following sentences selected here and there from the "Foreword" will give some idea of the spirit and style of the book: "This book is written in the conviction that God has direct and vital relations with the human soul. These relations embrace all that is significant or of lasting value in human character and destiny. I am quite aware that one writing on this subject [of "Religious Experience"] cannot hope to make successful appeal to all types of mind. There are minds, some quite diverse from others, whose doors are barred to any Christian reality whatsoever. The philosophy of Nietzsche, for instance, seems especially in Germany, to have much following. This philosophy is utterly godless. It is generally admitted that organized labor, representing a great army of citizenship, is, for the larger part, living in practical divorce from the Church. In what may be ranked as circles of culture and of privilege, there is a large contingency of mind characterized by agnosticism, or by the fixed mood of worldly indifference toward spiritual things. While a materialistic philosophy is justly relegated to the past, it is still woefully true that the lure of a practical materialism rests appallingly upon the life of the age."

These are the forces arrayed against Christianity. As over against them, "Christianity amply demonstrates its supreme fitness to receive, as above all its rivals, the universal approval and acceptance of mankind. The genius of Nietzschean philosophy is to transform man into a destructive wild beast. The incarnation of this philosophy into Prussian militarism has been decisive in plunging Europe into a hell of flame and of indescribable horrors. So far as the great army of labor is concerned, there is no

evidence that its acceptance of a materialistic guidance has demonstrated any power to promote among them the fruits either of sobriety, temperance, temporal prosperity, or the spirit of domestic or public peace. In the purely materialistic and plutocratic life of the present age there are to be encountered the same indifference, the same enmities toward Christianity with which St. Paul had to contend anciently in his mission to the pagan world. And this modern world-spirit yields the same fruits to civilization as did that ancient paganism to the age of Paul."

"Christianity in the meantime, whatever its faults or failures—and for the very reason that it seeks the moral transformation and uplift of an imperfect humanity, its human history is characterized by both faults and failures—nevertheless more conspicuously than ever before holds before the world the one prophetic, quenchless, and adequate light for the moral guidance of humanity. Historically measured, and in frankest admission of the moral imperfections of the present world-society, Christianity stands without a rival in working both toward the eradication of moral evil and the creation of ideal human character in the world."

The main discussion is divided into two parts. The first part deals with "Sources," and has chapters on "Source and Scope," "The Spiritual Sense," "The Holy Spirit," and "Conversion." Part second treats of "Evidential Values." Here there are chapters on "Christian Character," "Spiritual Fruits," "Christian Service," and then three chapters on "The Pragmatic Test."

If there is any difference in importance and value we would probably give the highest place to the chapter on "Conversion" in the first part, and to the three chapters on "The Pragmatic Test" in part second. The volume closes with an excellent "Bibliography," and a very full and satisfactory "Index."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Good Ministers of Jesus Christ.* By William Fraser McDowell, One of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Cloth. 8vo. Pp. 307. Price \$1.25 net.

This volume comprises the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale University for 1917. There are eight lectures. This seems to be recognized by a number of the more recent lecturers on this foundation as the proper limit for the course.



The topics for the separate lectures grow very naturally out of the general title chosen for the volume as a whole, *Good Ministers of Jesus Christ*. Or perhaps it was the other way about. The title for the book may have been selected as a very accurate summing up of the several characteristics of a good minister of Jesus Christ discussed in the lectures. At any rate there is perfect harmony between the two, the title of the book and the topic headings of the several lectures. These are *The Ministry of Revelation*, *The Ministry of Redemption*, *The Ministry of Incarnation*, *The Ministry of Reconciliation*, *The Ministry of Rescue*, *The Ministry of Conservation*, *The Ministry of Co-operation*, and *The Ministry of Inspiration*.

As there have been nearly fifty series of these lectures, all on the general subject of preaching, it would seem to be almost impossible that a lecturer now should be able to find anything new to say on it. Neither is it necessary that he should. There is a multitude of things that are so true and so important for the preacher that they need to be said over and over again, not only for each new generation of preachers, but even for the same generation, so that they may never be forgotten. If each succeeding lecturer were simply to repeat these same things in his own way, lighted up and made warm and living by his own experience and observation, the task would be worth while. As a matter of fact, however, there has been very little repetition from year to year. The several volumes differ in value, as a matter of course, but each one has been a distinct contribution to the general subject. It is our judgment that this latest volume by Bishop McDowell will take very high rank, and will stand among the very best of the entire series.

It was DeQuincy, was it not, who divided all literature into two classes; literature of knowledge, and literature of power. This volume on *Good Ministers of Jesus Christ* belongs pre-eminently to the second class. It is inspirational all through. It will give every minister who reads it a new and higher conception of the dignity and glory of the work of preaching the Gospel, and of the importance of doing it in the best way he can. Moreover, it will constantly send him back to Jesus Himself as the great model for all who take on themselves this ministry. Jesus Christ is put forward in every lecture as Himself the highest example, in His own life and work, of the particular phase of the ministry which is being emphasized, whether it be that of Revelation, or that of Redemption,



or Incarnation, or Reconciliation, or Rescue, or Conservation, or Co-operation, or Inspiration.

Where all is so good it is not easy to make distinctions. But in reading the book we have been especially impressed by the Second Lecture, on *The Ministry of Redemption*, and the Sixth, on *The Ministry of Conservation*. The first emphasizes the world's need of a Redeemer, as over against much of the modern talk about salvation by education, or improvement of environment. The second one lays needed stress on the necessity of caring for the children of the Church and properly training them for God's service. Both of these positions are especially pleasing to a Lutheran.

Bishop McDowell's thought is clear and vigorous, and his style is well suited to his thought. His lectures abound with striking passages, and especially with terse epigrammatic sentences which are not easily forgotten. The temptation is strong to quote extensively. A few sentences picked out here and there almost at random, must suffice to give a taste of what those may expect who will buy this book and read it. Our age is in sore need of a new vital vision or sense of God. . . . The world is likely to be rich enough and smart enough, but a world with a vague, or dull or mistaken sense of God cannot be a right world. . . . The cure for ordinariness is not sensationalism, but true supernaturalism. . . . Men are not saved by a doctrine, however true, nor by a phrase, however clear, nor by a proposition, however exact. Men are saved by a Person, only by a Person, and only by one Person. . . . There is no other name given under heaven or among men but the name of Jesus. There never has been a really great preacher who tried any other. And there is no way to restore our ministry to such power as it has lost except by setting again in the very center of that ministry Jesus Christ the Redeemer. . . Do not get mixed up about personal redemption, and social redemption, and world redemption. There is a fundamental law that one good thing is not a substitute for another. Do not get foolish and go to decrying individual salvation while pleading for the salvation of society. Do not lose sight of a man's relations in society either while you go after the man himself. . . Redemption is individual. You cannot get ahead one inch except on that basis. The trouble with the world is evil. Bad men, individual bad men, have to be made good men. The product is a Christian man, a saint in the process of development according to type, Jesus being the type. And redemption is social.



Men live together, are members of one another. The outcome is a kingdom, in the process also, according to type, the New Jerusalem being the type, a kingdom of world proportions and extent... The ministry of Jesus was not fundamentally a ministry against discomfort and misfortune, but against disobedience and evil, against spiritual wickedness, against alienation from God... A crucial test for every man at the beginning of his ministry is this: Do you intend to be the kind of minister who, by all the good means possible to you, will through all your ministry daily, nightly, constantly, unwearingly, lovingly, humbly, endeavor to bring men to God? . . . I know how some men choose to lay their emphasis upon social service, others upon an orderly worship, and others upon a didactic pulpit. And all this is well if the right motive and the right center be in it. But to what end, for what good are all these features of a ministry unless they bring men to God, unless they win men and hold them to Christ? . . . We reach the deadline by becoming dead men... Many motives are perfectly pure, pure as dewdrops, and about that size. Motive must be large enough to last and to move in. It takes a big motive to last a lifetime, to keep a ministry moving in power through forty or fifty years. . . . A preacher's language must always bleed when it is cut. His words must always be living words, like that other Minister's, who said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." . . . . We are not form-savers, nor method-savers, nor institution-savers, nor even truth-savers. We are ever and everywhere life-savers, the savers of all life, life that is lost, life that is not yet lost, life that has begun to be lost. . . . Do not worry lest your great abilities should be wasted on children. Only be afraid that your false pride and stupidity may prevent your doing a mighty work among them. The preacher or teacher who can keep or set the feet of childhood in the way of life is doing the largest work being done in the world to-day. . . . Men are afraid to get the reputation of being children's preachers. They are even careful not to seem to be getting or keeping children in large numbers in the Church. They would rather have their churches known as the church of the automobile than the church of the baby carriage. . . . It takes a lot of qualities to make a true shepherd. Heaven save the flock when the shepherd is a muttonhead. . . . Oratory of a sort may last a long time, and please many, but oratory, even religious oratory in a pulpit, is not preaching. A pulpit orator is rather a fearsome thing. . . . That ministry has



surely gone wrong which does not look richer and nobler to a man of sixty than it did to the same man at thirty. The deeper we get into the ministry of Jesus the fuller that ministry is seen to be.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. 150 FIFTH AVE., N. Y. C.

*John and His Writings.* By D. A. Hayes, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology of Garrett Biblical Institute, Chicago. Crown 8vo. Pp. 328. Price \$1.75 net.

This volume belongs to the "Biblical Introduction Series" being published by the Methodist Book Concern. It is a fine companion to the volume on "Paul and His Epistles" by the same author, published last year. They were evidently intended by the author to be used as companion volumes, as is seen from the opening paragraph of the "Foreword" to this second volume, in which he also indicates the relation which the two apostles and their writings sustain to each other, according to his judgment. He says: "At the close of our volume on Paul and His Epistles we said that John was the greatest theologian of the apostolic times; and while we recognized that the Pauline influence had dominated the thought and life of the Church at large, and we believe that it ought to do so until the missionary and evangelistic work of the Church was done, we prophesied that then the Johannine theology would be the supreme influence in the days of the Church's edification and consummation in love. That prophecy indicates our estimate of the final position to be accorded to the apostle John. We believe that as the Church grows in grace and becomes more and more like its Lord it will more and more agree with Him that John is the disciple most worthy of its love."

It will be seen from this also that Dr. Hayes unhesitatingly and unequivocally accepts the Johannine authorship of the five books of the New Testament usually ascribed to him, the fourth Gospel, the three epistles that bear his name, and the Book of Revelation. He does this, however, only after a thorough study of the problem and a very fair presentation of the arguments pro and con covering about forty pages.

At the close of the discussion he sums up his conclusion thus: "Everything written in opposition has been fully answered by the defenders of the authenticity of the



fourth Gospel and an illustrious line of authorities stretches over the whole period of the century or more since Evanson made his first assault and to them belongs the credit of maintaining intact the citadel of tradition which in this case as in so many others has proved to be the citadel of impregnable truth..... The scholarship of these defenders of the authenticity of the fourth Gospel has been equal or superior to that of their foes. It was of a saner quality and rested upon firmer and surer foundations, as the past century has shown. It is not likely that any discovery in the future will radically change the situation of to-day, as far as this question is concerned. The triumph of the truth through a hundred years will be maintained in the days to come. In reading the fourth Gospel we shall rest assured that we are coming into touch with that disciple whom Jesus loved most and who had the clearest insight into the Master's mission and message and mind."

It would be interesting to follow the author through his analysis of the several writings of the apostle John, and his discussion of the various problems that arise, but we could hardly hope to do justice to them within the limits of a brief review of the volume. We believe that it would be fairer to our readers as well as to the author to recommend the purchase of the volume and the careful study of it as a whole.

We are constrained, however, to quote yet two paragraphs, one of them containing a striking comparison between Paul and John, and the other giving a comparative estimate of the contents of John's Gospel, and his epistles, and the Book of Revelation.

As to the difference between Paul and John: "As his Gospel is better than any one of the synoptics, so we regard his first epistle as better than any one of the epistles of Paul. The difference in their writings marks the difference in the men. Paul is the greatest of the scribes, learned in the law; John is the greatest of the seers, learned in love. Paul deals with syllogisms; John deals with intuitions. Paul argues and convinces; John sees and declares. Paul is an advocate; John is a prophet. Paul proves with inevitable logic; John proclaims with irrefutable insight. Paul's proofs press upon each other like waves dashing over fortifications of sand on the beach. John's thought moves calmly and majestically like the ripples which spread outward in ever widening circles till they are lost to sight, when you drop a pebble into the dimpling surface of the sleeping lake."



As to the relation between the Gospel, the epistles and Revelation Dr. Hayes has this to say: "In the Gospel, John shows us Jesus in the flesh, in the epistles he pictures Christ in the heart, and in the Apocalypse he reveals Jesus the Christ as the Lord of heaven. In the Gospel we find the historical Jesus, in the epistles the Jesus of Christian experience, and in the Apocalypse Jesus the Lord of all and the King of glory. In the Gospel we have the fundamentals of the Christian's faith, in the epistles the fundamentals of the Christian's life and love, while in the Apocalypse we find the foundation of the Christian's undying hope. In the Gospel John is a historian, in the epistles a pastor, in the Apocalypse a seer—and in all his writings a Christian prophet and theologian beyond compare. Others may have been dominant in the past. Others may rule in the present. The future belongs to John. He increasingly will come to his own."

The volume is enriched by a multitude of foot notes giving references to the authorities quoted, and also has a very helpful Bibliography at the close containing one hundred and thirty titles. There is also an Index of Subjects, an Index of Texts quoted or referred to, and an Index of Names of Authors quoted or referred to.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

WOMEN'S LITERATURE HEADQUARTERS. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

*The Story of Lutheran Missions.* By Elsie Singmaster Lewars. Cloth or paper. 12mo. Pp. 220. Price 60 cents, cloth; 40 cents, paper, postpaid.

This book was prepared at the request of the Co-operative Literature Committee of the Woman's Missionary Societies of the Lutheran Church, representing the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South. It is the first book issued by that Committee. The Woman's Missionary Societies in all branches of the Lutheran Church have long felt the need for a readable history of Lutheran missions that might be used as a text book for study in the Societies. By joining their forces in these days of co-operation and unification they have produced a book that precisely meets the need and constitutes a worthy contribution to the positive celebration of the Quadricentennial of the Reformation.

*The Story of Lutheran Missions* is a study book. Each chapter is introduced with a detailed analysis of the contents of the chapter. The contents of the paragraphs are indicated on the margin. There are references to au-



thorities and to supplementary works on the subject. Thirty-five photographic illustrations add to the interest of the volume.

The volume is not exhaustive in details, but it is comprehensive in its view, well balanced in its proportions, and accurate in its information. Mrs. Lewars has taken pains to include every part of the Church in her narrative and to verify her statements. The only object of the book is to give a general survey of the missionary labors of the Lutheran Church in all lands. This object is attained and that too in the fascinating literary style for which the author is noted. The book is accurate history in the form of pleasing narrative.

Six chapters complete the story. Chapter One tells of "The Beginnings," showing how the divine plan of salvation involves the missionary enterprise, tracing the missionary idea through the Old and New Testaments, through the early Church, the mediaeval Church and the Reformation Age, and indicating the earliest impulses to Lutheran missionary endeavor before the modern era opened. Chapter Two, "Pioneers and Methods," takes up the story with Ziegenbalg, Plütschau, and Schwartz, and tells of the organization of the various Lutheran Missionary Societies. Then the mission fields are presented in turn. Chapter Three presents "The Lutheran Church in India." Chapter Four, "The Lutheran Church in Africa." Chapter Five, "The Lutheran Church in China, Japan, and Elsewhere." Chapter Six, "Lutheran Foreign Missions on the Western Continent."

The book will be in great demand and a first edition of 30,000 has been issued. The Committee in publishing the book expresses the hope that it may "help to unite our Lutheran forces in a determined missionary purpose to hasten the transformation of the twentieth century." The author also expresses the hope that the book may give the reader "a sense of the essential unity of the Lutheran Church and a renewed love for her and her history." Just this, the essential unity of the Lutheran Church before the primary task of world evangelization, is the most vivid impression made by a study of this volume.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. 66 FIFTH AVE., N. Y. C.

*The Best Man I Know*; Developed Out of the Will for the Good of All. By William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College. XII + 95 pages. Price 50 cents.

In this little volume President Hyde has given us a very delightful and inspiring booklet. "The Best Man I Know" is simply the fully developed Christian, "The Will for the Good of All," out of which he is developed is only another name for the old-fashioned Christian grace of Love. Whether there is any gain in the adoption of this new and rather strained terminology each reader must judge for himself. It may add something of interest and freshness. There are forty-five chapters, each of them occupying two pages, but really covering only a trifle more than one page of space. The first fifteen of them discuss the "Mystical Roots" of the Christian character and life, which are such as His Father, His Christ, His Spirit, His Regeneration, His Conversation, His Bible, His Sacraments, etc. The Second Part deals with "Practical Fruits." These are His Gratitude, His Charity, His Sympathy, Patience, Courage, etc.

As indicative of the general style of treatment, we quote one chapter entire, that on "His Bible." "While the Christian man gets his new life direct from the Father, from Christ, and from his fellow Christians, yet the Father and Christ at times seem vague and far away, and his fellow Christians are not always at hand. He needs a constantly available source of inspiration.

"The Bible gives him everywhere and always the expression and interpretation of the Father's Will for the good of all, the treasured words of Christ, the impulse of the Spirit, so that its regular reading gives him the needed steadiness and continuity of inspiration. He who reads the Bible in this vital way soon ceases to care whether all in its historical, or scientific, or even moral statements are accurate and up to date. Spiritual food, personal inspiration, is what the Christian man goes to the Bible for; and for that he never goes in vain."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*An Introduction to the Old Testament.* By Harlan Creelman, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature in Auburn Theological Seminary. Cloth. 8vo. Pp. xxxiv, 383. Price \$2.75.

The narrow limits of isagogics as set by literary criticism become strikingly apparent from a volume like this. The one question considered is the source and date of the material of the Old Testament. Professor Creelman has followed the critical theory to its logical conclusion and obliterated the division of the Old Testament into books.



This method he claims as his justification in offering to the public a new Introduction on the basis of the Critical hypothesis. The customary method followed in Old Testament Introductions has been to deal with the different books, following either the order in which they occur in our English versions, or according to their arrangement in the Hebrew Canon, or according to their grouping in such convenient literary divisions as history, prophecy and poetry. But that has always been an unnatural procedure for those who accept the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. Prof. Creelman has recognized this fact and has made a manual of the conclusions of those scholars who accept that hypothesis. It is a painstaking and thorough digest. One cannot but commend the work in itself considered. But it is still a question whether the assumptions of Criticism are so firmly established that such a wholesale reconstruction of the Old Testament as the Graf-Wellhausen scheme is the only scientific interpretation of the Old Testament. The key to it is, as is well known, the date of Deuteronomy; but a more intimate and persistent study of that book shows that the mere coincidence of the discovery of the Book of the Law by Hilkiah the Priest and the reforms of Josiah is not proof of the contemporaneous composition of the book. The theory raises more questions than it solves, and ultimately reduces Deuteronomy to a pious fraud. As Dr. John P. Peters has pointed out in the Psalter, the weakness of the Critical position is its insistence upon the time note in Hebrew literature.

“This mistaken principle of identification of the Psalms as occasional lyrics led inevitably to a further mistake in identification of their date and occasion by their contents, as that penitential psalms must indicate a period of calamity, and joyful and triumphal psalms a period of prosperity. This method of treating the Psalms has largely vitiated modern criticism and commentation on the Psalms, and led us into a pathless wilderness of subjective and conflicting vagaries.”

The true key to the Psalter is to be found in liturgics, and not in coincidence. Dr. Peters has called attention to the persistency of the elemental notes of liturgical hymns—contrition, confession, faith, praise, imprecation. These go back to the Sumerian psalms.

“One Sumerian hymn, originating in Nippur presumably as early as 3,000 B. C., contains a colophon stating that it was copied in 97 B. C. It was apparently still in use in that period. It was an act of religious merit to

preserve and propagate these hymns. . . . . A priori, we should expect something of the sort in the case of Hebrew ritual and liturgies. This is the oldest element and the most persistent. We have abundant evidence of the existence before the exile of the Temple Psalmody. . . . . It would be astonishing if all this were cast away, and a new psalmody created at a time when the greatest efforts were being made to restore the ancient Temple and to collect and conserve the ancient writings and traditions."

In other words, the mere coincidence of the note of penitence, and the consciousness of enemies of the soul, does not prove the exilic date of a psalm. A very striking example of coincidence has recently developed. It has been discovered that Julia Ward Howe's hymn "The Battle-Hymn of the Republic, is so well adapted to the present world-situation and so well expresses the aspirations which all the Allies are now fighting for, that it bids fair, because of this fact, to be adopted as our national hymn. By the rule of coincidence it was written yesterday; but we happen to know that it was not. It seems to us, therefore, that the grounds for this radical reconstruction of the Old Testament are insufficient to warrant the method of the volume before us.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

*Doctor Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther, A Biographical Sketch* by the Rev. D. H. Steffens, Baltimore. Cloth. Pp. 401.

This sketch is a transfusion of several German biographies or historical notices of the late Dr. Walther, the theological leader of the great Lutheran Missouri Synod. The author thinks of him as "easily the most commanding figure in the Lutheran Church of America during the nineteenth century." Perhaps this is too high an estimate. It has been claimed for him that he profoundly influenced the whole Lutheran Church in America, but this can be true only indirectly. The Synodical Conference, of which the Missouri Synod constitutes about three-fourths, numbers over 800,000 confirmed members, which is only about one-third of the entire Lutheran Church. While several of the district synods of larger general bodies were once temporarily connected with the Missourians, over one-half of the Lutheran Church of this country was entirely out of the sphere of Dr. Walther's influence.



This is not said in depreciation of this great and good man.

Dr. Walther was a man of extraordinary energy and apostolic devotion. His zeal for the truth and his self-denial in its advocacy mark him as a heroic example worthy of study and emulation. His courage and constancy in trial in the Fatherland and in America must evoke the sincere admiration of all who read the story of his life. His achievements are quite as wonderful as his endowments and his character. Like all great men he was probably in some respects arbitrary and narrow; but he was constructive and progressive. He lived to see the acorn grow into a giant oak. The future historian of the Church of America will give him a very high place on the roll of those whose memories should be honored for what they were and what they did.

It is not our purpose to review the teachings of this eminent leader. It has always seemed to us that in his sincere and laudable effort to escape Pelagianism and Synergism he became entangled in a semi-Calvinistic view of predestination, which the Lutheran Church of America as a whole will never accept. But for this and all that grew out of it the Synodical Conference would probably to-day embrace one-half of the Lutherans in this land.

We are grateful to Pastor Steffens for the work he has done in making Dr. Walther known to the English reader. The author modestly disclaims any special fitness for his task; but on the whole it has been well done. Here and there as is to be expected, the German idiom appears, and occasionally the main current of the narrative is lost in the affluents of numerous details. We heartily commend the volume to our readers, especially our English clergy who may have a hazy conception of Walther and "Missouri."

The book is handsomely gotten up by the Lutheran Publication Society. The paper is very fair and the printing and binding are excellent.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### BROCHURES.

*Luther's Battle Song*, by Bernhard Pick. Its History and Translations. Besides the versions in Low Saxon, Low German and English, Luther's hymn has been translated into fifty-one languages. Published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa. Paper. Pp. 40.

*List of References on the History of the Reformation*, compiled by George Linn Kieffer, and edited by Prof. W. W. Rockwell and O. H. Pannkoke. Published by the H. W. Wilson Co., N. Y. Paper. Pp. 60.

*Quellen und Dokumente zur Geschichte und Lehrstellung der ev.-Luth. Synode von Iowa u. a. Staaten.* Gesammelt von Professor George I. Fritschel, D.D. 2. und 3. Luferung. This is a valuable documentary history of Iowa Synod. Published by the Wartburg Publication House, Chicago. Paper. Pp. 95. Price 45 cents.

*The Professor of Wittenberg*, A Drama of the Reformation. By C. F. Malmberg, Ph.D., of Thiel College. The principal scenes of the early years of the Reformation are strikingly presented in dramatic form. The drama is highly endorsed by the historian, Dr. H. W. Elson, who bespeaks for it a wide acceptance and use during this memorable year. Published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa. Paper. Pp. 34. Price 15 cents.

*To What Extent May Christians Advisedly Dance.* A sermon preached by the Rev. Dr. O. D. Baltzly, in Kountze Memorial Ev. Lutheran Church, Omaha, Neb. This is a frightful arraignment of the modern dance. Few pastors have the courage to speak as plainly and directly as Dr. Baltzly has done. The facts cited justify this fearless exposure. Paper. Pp. 15. Price 5 cents for single copies; 50 cents per dozen; \$3.00 per hundred. Copies may be secured from Dr. Baltzly.

*The Word of a Woman versus the Word of God.* By the Rev. Alvin E. Bell, Toledo, Ohio. Three lectures on Eddyism (the so-called Christian Science). Published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa. This is a simple and telling exposure of the folly and irreverence of Eddyism. It should be widely read. Paper. Pp. 70. Price 35 cents.



# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER 1917.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### LUTHER AND THE REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

True religion has never been utterly unknown among men. In every age there has been at least a "remnant" who called upon the Lord. There have always been men like Enoch who walked with God. In the darkest days of Judaism there were inner circles of earnest, devout men and women who waited for the consolation of Israel and in the times of the persecutions of early Christians the incense of true worship rose from caves and catacombs.

During the Middle Ages when ignorance, scholasticism, worldliness and formalism had well nigh strangled the Church, here and there the fires of devotion glimmered amid the general darkness, but never burst into an illuminating flame until it pleased God to raise up Martin Luther to restore primitive Christianity.

The noble army of martyrs who died in defense of their faith certainly did not live and die in vain; and it would be unfair to their memory and disloyal to the truth to minimize their heroic devotion to conviction. It is not necessary to take from their brows laurels with which to crown Luther. Each has a glory peculiar to himself and each deserves to be held in grateful recognition for what

he strove to do. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that Luther succeeded where his precursors failed. The passing centuries emphasize his supremacy not only over his precursors but over his contemporaries and successors. Even Zwingli and Calvin, who wrought so nobly to deliver the Church from error, were largely indebted to Luther for inspiration and suggestion.

Great claims have been made for "The Reformers before the Reformation" as the pioneers who made the Reformation possible and to whom Luther was deeply indebted. In his admirable work entitled *Reformers Before the Reformation*, published about seventy-five years ago, Dr. C. Ullman of Heidelberg, takes the position that the Reformation was "a great historical result, the issue of a spiritual process extending through centuries." "We must suppose it," says he, "to have had very great antecedents. Like a giant oak such a phenomenon in the history of the world could not have been produced without deep and wide-spread roots, and a firm ground from which to grow. It betrays a lack of historical insight to attempt to explain it merely by the qualities of the actors or the transitory interests of the age."

"Is it possible," asks Ullman, "that Luther and his associates, or the men whom we see taking the field on the Rhine, downwards to the Netherlands, should have dropped as Reformers from heaven, or received their impulse or insight from a foreign land? No certainly. Even the law of historical continuity would require us to suppose corresponding intermediate links, laborers who prepared this particular soil."

Ullman's question, however, is misleading, and implies that no reformation is possible unless it have its precursors! This is absurd, for the question at once arises where did the precursors receive the impulse to reformation?

It is true, as Ullman says, that Luther acknowledges his indebtedness to others who went before him, but as far as I can find Luther nowhere declares that he received the impulse of the Reformation from any man. "Of John of Wesel, he says, that he had studied his writings



for his degree; of the Brethern of the Common Lot, that they were the first to receive the gospel; of Wessel, that it might seem as if he had derived from him all he knew; of Tauler that neither in the Latin or German tongue, does there exist a more sound or evangelical theology than his; of the author of the *Deutsche Theologie* that no one had instructed him better what God and Christ and all things are; and finally of Staupitz that by his means the light of the gospel had first dawned on his heart." (Ullman 1:13.)

Of all these, Wesel and Staupitz alone could have influenced Luther. But of the former as well as of Occam, Peter D' Ailly, John Gerson and Gabriel Biel, whose works were studied in the University at Erfurt, it may be said that they did not lead him into the light, for his deep soul-struggles took place after he had gone into the cloister. In his bitter struggles there, the memory of none of these great men and their teachings came to his assistance. Staupitz alone may be credited with real help to Luther in finding personal peace and in directing him to Paul. Staupitz, however, was not a reformer, but remained true to the Roman Church to the end of life.

We do not accept Ullman's philosophy nor his citation of facts as adequate grounds for his contention that Luther must have been greatly indebted to the men whom he has named or to any others. On the contrary we believe that the facts very clearly show that Luther's indebtedness to other reformers was exceedingly small. The theory that the Reformation can be accounted for only as the result of a spiritual movement in history reaching its culmination in Luther does not seem to be sustained by the facts, for no such progressive evolution is observable. The explanation is, to some extent at least, purely naturalistic or rationalistic without, of course, meaning to be so. It ignores too much the supernatural in history, especially as it manifests itself in subjective true religion and in the endowment of overshadowing Personalities.

Religion is a divinely wrought experience and attitude of the soul—the work of the Holy Spirit through the

word of God. This experience is possible without any logical historical sequences. Luther and the Reformation are the product of the Supernatural Spirit, who works when and where He pleases. The Reformation was really "a sudden conversion" rather than a product of historical development. It was a fresh and spontaneous outburst of protest and creative activity from the heart of Luther, uninfluenced to any perceptible degree by the past. It came from the realization of a deep personal need rather than from any pressure for reform from without. The glorification of Luther is not for one moment the purpose of the writer. It is rather to emphasize the truth that God uses the Scriptures as the means by which to make men Christians and if need be Reformers.

The Reformation, however great an event, is much more than an event; it is a parable, a prophecy, a promise, a revelation. Luther was after all only an instrument in God's hand for the awakening of the world to a proper conception of personal religion. He brought out the truth that the Bible is always God's message to man, that it is accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit, who awakens faith in the one that sincerely reads or hears the Word. Luther was in a very real sense the discoverer of the Bible, not simply as its translator but much more as its interpreter.

The facts of the Reformation, therefore, plainly contradict the theory that it was the culmination of a historic development through reformers before the Reformation. It was in fact a new movement which was started in the heart of Luther by the Holy Spirit who had enlightened him through the Sacred Scriptures. It was the result of divine truth working through a richly endowed Personality. In substantiation of the position that Luther was very slightly indebted to the so-called "reformers before the Reformation," it will be necessary to examine the history and teaching of the more prominent of them.

In the celebrated Luther Memorial at Worms (unveiled



in 1868) where his colossal statue rises high above those of Waldo and Wyclif, Huss and Savonarola, we have an artistic recognition of Luther's relation to his precursors. They were engaged in like tasks, but he succeeded while they failed. Waldo, who died in 1218, represents the reformatory work in France. Wycliffe, who died in 1384, stands for reform in England. John Huss, who was put to death in 1415, represents Bohemia; and Savonarola, who was slain in 1498, Italy.

Peter Waldo, after whom the Waldenses are named, was a wealthy merchant of Lyons. About the year 1190 he came under the influence of a minstrel who sang the praises of pious pilgrims. Deeply impressed by his sinfulness, Waldo sought peace by renouncing his wealth and his family and taking a formal vow of poverty. Soon others of like mind joined him and formed the society of the "Poor Men." Their devotion favorably impressed the Pope who gave them some recognition but forbade them to preach. The Waldenses soon spread throughout Europe, but were divided into various sects of which the Lombards were the most influential. In their migrations the Waldenses came into touch with the Hussites, and in times of persecution found a refuge in Bohemia and Moravia. The modern Waldenses are found principally in Italy with affiliated churches in North and South America, and are evangelical in their faith.

The doctrines of the original Waldenses did not differ essentially from those of the Roman Church, except that they exalted the Bible and recognized the priesthood of the laity. Their protest against the papacy was directed chiefly against "abuses." Of the doctrine of justification by faith they knew nothing. They were forerunners of Luther as opposed to the papacy, but were not his teachers.

The illustrious John Wyclif, often called the Morning Star of the Reformation, was born in Yorkshire, England, between 1320 and 1330, and died Dec. 31, 1384, a century before the birth of Luther. The effort to trace his reformatory impulse to the influence of the Walden-



ses has not been successful. He seems to have come to the light through the study of the Scriptures, much as Luther did. He saw the errors of the papacy and was in cordial sympathy with the "Good Parliament" of 1376-77 in its efforts to abridge the temporal power of the Pope. His principal work was his participation in the translation of the Bible and his writings against the papacy. By the latter he deeply impressed Huss and had the distinguished post mortem honor of being condemned with Huss at the Council of Constance, where his books were ordered to be burned and his body exhumed and committed to the flames. This was carried out twelve years later and his ashes cast into the River Swift.

Wyclif's teachings seem to have been strictly independent. He distinctly repudiated the charge that he imbibed his views from Occam. Like most of the earlier reformers he denounced the errors and pretensions of the papacy, but failed to apprehend the great central truth of justification as Luther did. Melanchthon, in a letter to Myconius, declared that Wyclif was wholly ignorant of the doctrine of justification by faith, and that he had foolishly mixed up the Gospel and politics. Luther knew Wyclif only at second hand. Dr. D. S. Schaff (*History of Christian Church*, v. Part ii, 346, 347) says, "Had Luther had access to the splendid shelf of volumes issued by the Wyclif Society, he might have said of the English Reformer what he said of Wessel's works when they were placed in his hands. The reason why no organized reformation followed Wyclif's labors is best given when we say, the time was not yet ripe. And after all the parallelisms are stated between his opinions and the doctrines of the Reformers, it will remain true, that evangelical as he was in speech and patriotic as he was in spirit, the Englishman never ceased to be a schoolman. Luther was fully a man of the new age."

John Huss, the famous reformer, was born in Bohemia in 1369 and was burned at the stake at Constance by order of the Council of that name, June 6, 1415. He imbibed his reformatory ideas from the writings of Wyclif



which had been brought from England by Jerome of Prague in 1401 or 1402. The connection between Bohemia and England is explained by the marriage of King Wenceslaus' sister, Anne, with Richard II of England in 1382. The teachings of Huss are an exact reproduction of those of Wyclif, some of whose writings he translated and published as his own. His murder was in violation of the safe-conduct given by the Emperor Sigismund. His ashes were thrown into the Rhine as those of his illustrious predecessor were cast into the Swift.

There is no evidence that Luther was influenced in the beginning of his career by a knowledge of Huss. His first acquaintance with Huss came through the perusal of some of his sermons found in the cloister library at Erfurt. "Curious to see what the arch-heretic had taught, and feeling justified in the investigation since his book had been preserved unburned, he found so much that he was filled with amazement, and wondered why such a man, able to handle the Scriptures in such a Christian spirit and so powerfully, should have been burned. But as the name of Huss rested under such fearful condemnation that he thought the walls would become black and the sun darkened if it were ever mentioned, he closed the book and went away with a bleeding heart. He found some consolation in the thought, that Huss had perhaps written these things before he became a heretic. Luther afterwards declared that he was when a monk such a rabid papist, that he would have been ready to murder all who should by even the smallest syllable refuse obedience to the Pope, or at least would have found pleasure in their murder and would have helped to accomplish it." "The Theology of Luther," Koestlin (Hay) I:51.

At the Leipzig Disputation in the summer of 1519 Luther boldly asserted that the Council of Constance had erred in condemning Huss. From this it was once thought that Luther must have had an extensive acquaintance with the writings of Huss; but it has been shown that only in October of that year did he receive a copy of his works from the Bohemian Brethren themselves, who

sent representatives to assure him of their sympathy with him in his struggles against the papacy. Luther declared later that he believed he should yet discover that he himself, and even Staupitz, had without knowing it been teaching Hussite doctrine, and that even Paul and Augustine were literally Hussites!

Turning from Waldo, the Frenchman, and Wyclif, the Englishman, and Huss, the Bohemian, we come to Savonarola, the Italian, who became a martyr to his faith in 1498, when Luther was a lad of fifteen. When Catholics, who heard that the Rietschel, the sculptor and designer of the Worms Memorial proposed to give Savonarola a place, wrote to show the impropriety of including him, the sculptor wrote to Hase for his opinion. The venerable church historian replied, "It makes no difference whether they counted Savonarola a heretic or a saint, he was in either case a precursor of the Reformation and so Luther recognized him." Speaking of Savonarola's Exposition of the Psalms, Luther said that, although "some clay stuck to Savonarola's theology, it is a pure and beautiful example of what is to be believed, trusted and hoped from God's mercy and how we come to despair of works. Christ canonizes Savonarola through us even though popes and papists burst to pieces over it."

Savonarola was a precursor of the Reformation in denying that the grace of God can be obtained on the ground of merit, but he was by no means an advocate of the doctrine of justification by faith, the distinguishing tenet of the Reformation. He was condemned for rebelling against the authority of Pope Pius II. He was a preacher of great power, and a patriot of deep devotion. But he failed in his effort as a statesman, as did Zwingli and Calvin later. His death was tragic. He was hanged and his body burned and the ashes cast into the Arno.

Turning now from the reformers represented in the Worms Memorial let us briefly examine the teachings of some of the lesser reformers, for whom Ullman makes such large claims (Vol. I:133f.)

John Pupper (1400-1475), usually called John of Goch



from his birthplace, lived and died in the bosom of the Church, and received honorable interment in the chapel of the priory of which he had so long been superior. With the exception of a literary attack on the part of the Dominicans with whom he had found fault, there is no evidence that he gave any offense, excited the suspicion of the hierarchy, or endured the slightest persecution. "Beyond his own immediate and quiet circle," says Ullman, "Goch's influence seems at first not to have extended. At least there are none of the more celebrated Reformers on whom it can be shown to have operated in the way of exciting, instructing, or determining the bent of their minds. In particular, we can find no trace of Luther's having been acquainted with his writings and labors."

In spite of this statement Ullman nevertheless claims that Goch prepared the ground for the seed that Luther later sowed. He asserts that Goch starts "not merely with the formal principle of the Reformation, by founding all Christian doctrine upon Scripture, but also with its material principle, which is the justification of the sinner in the sight of God, effected not by works but solely by a living faith in Christ." Over against this claim, Otto Clemen,<sup>1</sup> a late biographer of Goch says, "In the central point of reformatory dogmatics, in the doctrine of justification, he still stood on the ground of the Middle Ages." It must be apparent that Luther was in no sense influenced by Goch, however praiseworthy his teachings may have been.

John of Wesel, who died in 1481, two years before Luther's birth, graduated at the University of Erfurt in 1445, and shortly after was elected professor. Toward the end of 1460 he was canon at Worms; in 1461 he was professor at Heidelberg; and in 1463 preacher at the cathedral in Worms. Professor Otto Clemen says, that "Johann von Lutter, many years a colleague of Wesel at Erfurt, reports that Wesel often said from his chair that he would maintain nothing which was dissonant from

1 Schaff-Herzog in loco.



the teaching of the Roman Church or the doctrines of its approved doctors." However, later "his sermons [at Worms] caused offense, now by pedantic and confused speculation, now by bold attacks upon the Church, its sacraments, teachings and tendencies." The substance of his offense against the Church is summed up in a sentence at the close of his *Paradoxa*: "I despise pope, Church, and councils; I love Christ. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly."

Such utterances and his relations with a Bohemian adventurer finally aroused the opposition of the archbishop who put him on trial. He was then a man of eighty. He was found guilty, and though he publicly recanted he was nevertheless condemned to spend his last years as a penitent in the Augustinian monastery at Mainz.

When Luther was a student at Erfurt, about fifty years after Wesel had taught there, he found Wesel's books still in use. He once said, "I remember how Master John Wesalia ruled the university by his writings, through the study of which I also became a master." Evidently these writings contained nothing offensive to the authorities, otherwise they would have been excluded. Luther's dependence upon Wesel for reformatory impulses amounted to practically nothing. In his struggles in the cloister he never seems to have thought of him. After the Reformation was fairly under way he alludes kindly to Wesel, but only in an incidental way.

Of the character of Johann Wessel (1419-1489) Luther had a very high opinion; and in the preface to a small volume of Wessel's Essays, which Luther published in 1522, he says, "If I had read Wessel earlier my enemies might have said that Luther drew everything from Wessel; so well do our two minds agree."

This sentence explains the relation of Luther to Wessel. He discovered the latter after the Reformation had begun and found comfort in his protests against the Pope and indulgences. A correct estimate of Wessel concludes a review of him by Professor S. D. van Veen



(Schaff-Herzog): "While Wessel has been perhaps too enthusiastically praised by Ullman, it is equally a mistake to consider him an orthodox churchman. That he foreshadowed the German Reformation is evinced by his teachings. Yet in many respects Wessel's face was turned backward toward Augustine and Bernard."

Loofs (*Dogmengeschichte* p. 658) declares: "Goch, Wesel and Wessel were not Reformers before the Reformation. Nevertheless they are witnesses that at the close of the Middle Ages the preparation for the Reformation was not merely negative."

Finally mention should be made of John Tauler (1300-1361) whom Luther mentions as "a man of God" and whose sermons he commends. Luther was drawn to him by his deep earnestness and the practical adaptation of his teaching to everyday life. The warmth of his addresses, coming from a deeply mystical nature, appealed to Luther as being in harmony with his own experience. But Luther really derived nothing of a doctrinal nature from Tauler, for the latter was in matters of doctrine a true son of the Church. He broke with the Pope on the question of Excommunication, holding that the Church had no right to exclude the poor and ignorant and let them die without the consolations of religion. For expressing such ideas Tauler was himself excommunicated. It was his opposition to the papacy that must have pleased Luther. Recent study of Tauler shows that he was infected with the errors of mysticism which Luther thoroughly abhorred. "It would be difficult to acquit Tauler of pantheism." "At bottom he was in accord with the libertine trend. Likewise in his attitude to the revealed Word, he is no more entitled to the name of forerunner of the Reformation. In particular instances he insisted upon the fundamental importance of the Scriptures, but at the same time he placed the inner Word or Christ enthroned within the obedient man, as of higher authority. As to the Church, he is so prepossessed by his estimation of the personal relation to God that he loses all appreciation for the ordinances in spite of inci-

dental recognition of them. To him the Friends of God, who are in immediate contact with God take the place of the Church. The visible Church has only a preliminary pedagogical worth, to be forsaken as soon as the inner Word is perceived." (Ferdinand Cohrs in Schaff-Herzog).

The very brief outline of the lives and teachings of these so-called reformers seems to show that they failed in their grasp of fundamental problems and really had very little to offer to Luther, even if he had known their teachings thoroughly.

Luther's generous estimate of all who opposed the errors of Rome in one way or another is not to be construed into an acknowledgment of personal indebtedness to any of them for reformatory impulses or an approval of everything which they may have taught. He was grateful to find here and there one who questioned the assumptions of the papacy.

Luther was called to be a Reformer somewhat as Paul was called to be an Apostle, the former *mediately* through the Word, the latter *immediately* by the Lord Himself. In all the centuries between Paul and Luther no public teacher had adequately interpreted Paul. The emphasis which Luther placed on the doctrines of sin and the Person and Work of Christ is altogether Pauline.

The question why Luther succeeded while the reformers before the Reformation failed is not answered as Schaff says in reference to Wyclif, "The time was not ripe." It cannot be denied that some ages have not appreciated their leaders and their opportunities; and that the public mind must generally be prepared for great changes by long agitation; witness the struggle for the abolition of slavery, and the prohibition of the sale of intoxicants. But even these reforms are brought about largely by highly endowed minds set on fire by great convictions.

Politically the times were propitious for Luther. His nation was tired of Roman dictation, and the affairs of the Empire compelled concessions to the Germans. However, similar conditions had long prevailed in the history



of Germany, but there was then no prophet and no vision, no mighty personality impelled by religious motives to incarnate revolt and reform. Luther was not only liberated in conscience himself, but he knew how to present truth, expose error, shape circumstances and repel attacks. He created by his incessant preaching and writing an atmosphere and environment in which liberty could exist and flourish.

Moreover, Luther's Reformation was much more than the removal of error and abuses. By the grace of God, he made the tree good. While the efforts of his predecessors were not altogether negative, they were too much so; and usually they failed to offer an adequate substitute for that which they endeavored to remove. Sometimes they tried to remove too much and were so radical in their break with the past that the continuity of the Church was broken.

The earlier reformers failed because they did not have a clear conception and a strong hold on the doctrine of Christ and His sufficiency and His accessibility. This Luther apprehended in his personal experience, presented in his doctrine of Justification by Faith, and emphasized with all his consecrated genius, not as a dogma, to be received because it was taught, but as the embodiment of the most essential and life-giving truth.

Luther succeeded also by keeping on the broad highway of truth, avoiding the many specious and alluring by-paths into which others strayed and never returned. He was in the true sense a mystic, but he was not of the mystics with their vagaries and denial of the external word and ordinances. He was a humanist in his use and appreciation of the classics and of historical criticism, but humanism was to him more than a mere academic performance. He gave it a religious trend and made it subservient to the Scriptures. He was a social reformer and could plead for the rights of the poor as no other man of his time, but he could not be misled into breaking up all order and introducing chaos and anarchy.

Luther had the true view of ordinary life as over

against the various monastic orders which endowed self-denial and celibacy with a false sanctity and which gave rise to the most atrocious scandal. He took the broad view that whatever was necessary and natural in human life was good and should be used according to the intent of the beneficent Creator.

Lindsay (in his *History of the Reformation* 191f.) has differentiated Luther from others in the following significant language:

"History knows nothing of revivals of moral living apart from some new religious impulse. The motive power needed has always come through leaders who have had communion with the unseen. Humanism had supplied a superfluity of teachers; the times needed a prophet. They received one; a man of the people; bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh; one who had himself lived that popular religious life with all the thoroughness of a strong, earnest nature, who had sounded all its depths and tested all its capacities, and gained in the end no relief for his burdened conscience; who had at last found his way into the presence of God, and who knew by his own personal experience, that the living God was accessible to every Christian. He had won the freedom of a Christian man, and had reached through faith a joy in living far deeper than that which Humanism boasted. He became a leader of men, because his joyous faith made him a hero by delivering him from all fear of Church or of clergy—the fear which had weighed down the consciences of men for generations. Men could see what faith was when they looked at Luther."

*Theological Seminary,  
Gettysburg, Pa.*



## ARTICLE II.

## WAS THERE NEED OF THE REFORMATION?

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D.

Four hundred years ago a quiet humble monk of the Roman Catholic Church—the only Church then in Western Europe, who was an inmate of the Augustinian Monastery in Wittenberg in Saxony and a teacher in the theological department of the University which the ruler of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, had established there eleven years before, nailed up on the door of the Castle Church in that city a long document in Latin containing 95 propositions or theses, which had to do with the sale of indulgences which was then going on in parts of Germany. A setting forth of theses did not mean necessarily that the author indorsed them (though in this case he did), it meant only that as scholastic exercise they were put out for discussion, and which the author was ready to defend against all comers, something similar to a side taken in a college debate. Though the theses were not published, only posted, they were soon known all over the land and created intense furor. They have been looked upon ever since as the beginning of the Reformation, and in 1617, 1717, and 1817 celebrations in their honor were held in Protestant lands. Scholars in Germany have discussed the question whether that date was really the most fitting as the beginning of the Reformation, and the general answer has been that it is, and that answer is wise. Historically and theologically the Reformation started from the 95 Theses.

What was the Reformation? It was exactly what it says: a reformation, that is, a cleaning, an improvement, an amendment of something already existing. College professors have the fashion now of calling it the Protestant Revolution, and like other fashions this has spread widely; but the old wisdom of the ages is wiser than the

new smartness, and if the college teacher knew as much about religion and theology as he does about the external results of history he would hesitate before discarding the old word for the new. Of course certain things were turned over and turned around and turned back and so etymologically there was a Revolution after 1517, and if we think of that word as expressing the radicalness of the change, it is true that there were fundamental alterations brought in over a part of Christendom. For instance, the papal power entirely disappeared over northern Germany, what are now the three Scandinavian countries, a part of Switzerland and of the Low Countries, and the British Islands. Certain important doctrines also went and the papal hierarchy. All this was such a deep cleft with past history that it might well be called a Revolution. Still the word Reformation is more historically just. All the Reformers were Roman Catholics and they had no intention of doing away any important element in the Church as they received it,—only of cutting away barnacles which had attached to it through the ages, a reforming or reshaping rather than an overturning. They brought in no new doctrines, but only those which had been believed of old. Though they had to restore a Church organization that was not papal, they followed old precedents or tried to go along lines with which everyone was familiar. Neither in polity nor doctrine was the Reformation revolutionary. In fact Luther was one of the most conservative men of his age, and it is a miracle of history that such a man as he brought about changes so profound.

Yes, there were changes that came from 1517, and it is the part of this paper to indicate those changes by telling two or three things that needed change. (There is not space to give here the doctrinal need.)

First, there was the financial or economic need. Ever since the publication of the first volume of Karl Marx's *Kapital* in 1867, one of the very greatest books in the history of literature, we have been familiar with the idea that the determining factor in history is not politics, is



not religion, but is economics alone. That idea has been taken up by the professional teachers of history especially in America, and is now taken for granted by the whole fraternity. A popular exposition of it can be found in Professor Seligman's *Economic Interpretation of History* N.Y. 1902, rev. ed. 1907. Now this economic factor certainly was working before and at the Reformation, and the college professor is apt to make it the chief factor in producing what he calls the Protestant Revolution. Some theological professors have—somewhat inconsiderately, in my judgment—taken over this interpretation of the Reformation, and one of them, my learned friend, Professor Vedder of Crozer Theological Seminary, has written a history of the movement from that point of view (*The Reformation in Germany*, 1914). But to show how impossible it is to reduce a complex movement like the Reformation, where religion was at least a leading factor, to an economic denominator, after Professor Vedder gets through his introduction and launches into the deep waters of the history, we lose sight almost entirely of the economic features, and the real forces are reckoned with. Though this proves that we cannot judge the Reformation mainly from the Marxian rule, it does not follow that financial or economic considerations did not play a very important part. They did indeed.

In Luther's celebrated *Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (1520) he speaks of some of these financial abuses. He says that cardinals were created in large numbers in Italy to bring under the influence of Rome the bishoprics and other rich foundations. These benefices were given to cardinals who were often non-resident, so that the bishoprics and monasteries were decayed and all Italy laid waste, the cardinals taking the revenues but doing no work. For instance, Cardinal Della Rovere afterwards Pope Julius II (1503-13) held at one and the same time the archbishopric of Avignon, the bishopric of Bologna, Lausanne, Coutancis, Vivers, Mende, Ostia, and Velletri, and the abbacies of Nonatola

and Grottaferrata. "No Turk could have so devastated Italy and suppressed the worship of God."

"Now that Italy is sucked dry (continues Luther), they come into Germany, and begin Oh, so gently. But let us beware, or Germany will soon become like Italy. Already we have some cardinals; what the Romans seek by that the "Drunken Germans" (an epithet applied to them by the Romans) are not to understand until we have not a bishopric, a monastery, a living, a benefice, a heller or a pfenning left. Antichrist must take the treasures of the earth, as it was prophesied. So it goes on. They skim the cream off the bishoprics, monasteries and benefices, and because they do not yet venture to turn them all to shameful use, as they have done in Italy, they only practice for the present the sacred trickery of coupling together ten or twenty prelacies and taking a yearly portion from each of them, so as to make a tidy sum. The priory of Würzburg yielded a thousand gulden; that of Bamberg something; Mainz, Trier and the others something more; and so from one to ten thousand gulden might be got together, in order that a cardinal might live in Rome like a rich king.<sup>1</sup> . . . If ninety-nine parts of the papal court were done away, it would be still large enough to give decisions in matters of faith. Now however there is such a swarm of vermin yonder in Rome all boasting that they are papal that there was nothing like it in Babylon. There are more than 3,000 papal secretaries alone. Who will count the other offices, when they are so many that they scarcely can be counted? and they all lie in wait for the prebends and benefices of Germany as wolves lie in wait for the sheep. I believe that Germany now gives more to the pope of Rome than it gave in former times to the emperors. Indeed some estimate that every year more than 300,000 gulden find their way from Germany to Rome, quite uselessly; we get nothing for it but scorn and contempt. And yet we wonder that princes, nobles, cities, endowments, land and people are impoverished.

<sup>1</sup> Works, ii, 81-82 (Mt. Airy, Phila., transl. 1915).



In former times German emperors and princes permitted the pope to receive annates from all the benefices of the German nation, i. e., the half of the first years revenues from each benefice. This permission was given, however, in order that by means of these large sums of money the pope might accumulate a treasure for fighting against the Turks and infidels in defense of Christendom, so that the burden of the war might not rest too heavily on the nobility, but that the clergy also should contribute something toward it. This simple-hearted devotion of the German nation the popes have so used that they have received this money for more than a hundred years (began beginning of the 14th century), have now made it a binding tax and tribute, and have not only accumulated no treasure, but have used the money to endow many orders and offices at Rome, and to provide these offices with salaries, as though the annates were a fixed rent. . . . . If one holds an appointment free from Rome and dies at Rome or on the way, his living forever belongs to Rome, and yet the Roman see will not be called robbers, though they are guilty of such robbery as no one has ever heard or read about. If any one belongs to the household of pope or cardinals, then his benefice falls to Rome. But who can count the household of the pope or cardinals? When the pope goes out on a pleasure ride he takes with him 3,000 or 4,000 muleriders, eclipsing emperors and kings. Christ and St. Peter went on foot that their vicars might have more splendor. Then when a contest is started at Rome over a living, the benefice contested belongs to Rome, and the right occupant must settle with money or lose. When not contested at home, unnumbered knaves will be found at Rome to dig up contests out of the earth and assail livings at their will. It would be no wonder if God were to rain from heaven fire and brimstone to sink Rome in the abyss, as he did Sodom and Gomorrah of old. Why should there be a pope in Christendom if his power is used for nothing else than such arch knavery, and if he protects and practices it? O noble princes and lords, how long will ye leave your lands

and people naked to these ravening wolves! The pope's pallium of an archbishop costs 20,000 gulden, though it was originally bestowed gratis. . . . . When a prebend or bishopric is held by a sick or old man, without his desire or consent a coadjutor is assigned to him by the pope and that brings the see into the hands of the pope. . . . . The pope entrusts the keeping of a rich fat monastery or Church to a cardinal, who can drive out the regular incumbent, take the revenues, and install a renegade monk for five or six gulden."<sup>2</sup>

I could give many other facts of the financial exploitation of the people, clergy and churches by the papal authorities, but these passages from Luther's own words must suffice. These things had been a matter of frequent complaint, and they caused bitter thoughts in all parts of the world, and made Europe feel that everybody and everything existed for one purpose only,—to fatten the pockets and the bellies of the prelates in Rome. At the Drew Summer School of 1917 the addresses of one of our own men<sup>3</sup> on foreigners as a Church problem emphasized the fact that the Bohemians, Hungarians, Italians, etc., that he met within his work in Cleveland had that same feeling toward the Roman Church which comes out in the documents of the Reformation period, viz., resentment toward their exploitation by the Church, a resentment which is carried over against Christianity itself, and makes them distrust, if not hate, all Churches. Certainly a crying need for a Reformation was the financial or economic need.

Second, there was what I call the penitential need, though this too became involved in the everlasting cry for more money. In the third century those who lapsed seriously from Christ were compelled to some form of penance, and were either not readmitted into full Church membership until near death, or recommended to the mercy of God and not readmitted at all. Later discipline declined, and refusal of Communion was the only penance

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 83-92 (abridged).

<sup>3</sup> The Rev. Elmer E. Pearce, pastor of Broadway Church, Cleveland.



exacted of gross offenders. In the early part of the Middle Ages with the incoming of thousands of rough barbarians into the Church, more stringent measures had to be taken, and the Church developed quite a penitential system. For instance if a monk got drunk so that he vomited, he had to do penance for thirty days; if a presbyter or deacon got drunk he had to do penance for forty days. If one committed fornication with a virgin he must be penitent one year, if with a married woman four years. As a final resort excommunication or anathema was resorted to, that is, cutting off the offender from the Church. And as everybody was a member of the Roman Church in Western Europe, as such membership was considered necessary to salvation, and as no help or social fellowship could be given to an excommunicate, the condition of a person thus cut off was fearful. He was what the Germans call *vogelfrei*, that is, free to be injured, attacked, robbed, killed. He was in a world where every person must look upon him as a mortal enemy, but where the precept of the apostle is reversed, If thine enemy hunger starve him, if he thirst give him no drink or poisoned drink, if he meet thee slay him. The eminent historian, the late Dr. Henry Charles Lea, of Philadelphia, has translated one of these excommunications, and it is so interesting I give it. Some one threatened to appropriate lands belonging to the monastery of St. Giles, Provence, France, and Pope Benedict VIII, about 1014, sent him to hell in vigorous language.

“Benedict, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Count William and his mother the Countess Adelaide, perpetual grace and apostolic benediction..Let them (who attempt to rob the monastery) be accursed in their bodies, and let their souls be delivered to destruction and perdition and torture. Let them be damned with the damned; let them be scourged with the ungrateful; let them perish with the proud. Let them be accursed with the Jews who, seeing the incarnate Christ, did not believe but sought to crucify him. Let them be accursed with the heretics who labored to destroy the Church. Let them be accursed with those who blaspheme the name of God.



Let them be accursed with those who despair the mercy of God. Let them be accursed with those who lie damned in hell. Let them be accursed with the impious and sinners unless they amend their ways, and confess themselves at fault toward St. Giles. Let them be accursed in the four quarters of the earth. In the east be accursed, in the west disinherited, in the north interdicted, in the south excommunicated. Be they accursed in the day, and excommunicate in the night. Accursed be they at home and excommunicate abroad; accursed in standing and excommunicate in sitting; accursed in eating, accursed in drinking, accursed in sleeping, and excommunicate in waking; accursed when they work and excommunicate when they rest. Let them be accursed in the spring and excommunicate in the summer; accursed in the autumn and excommunicate in the winter. Let them be accursed in this world and excommunicate in the next. Let their lands pass into the hands of the stranger, their wives be given over to perdition, and their children fall by the edge of the sword. Let what they eat be accursed, and accursed be what they leave, so that he who eats it shall be accursed. Accursed and excommunicate be the priest who shall give them the body and blood of the Lord, or who shall visit them in sickness. Accursed and excommunicate shall he be who shall carry them to the grave, and shall dare to bury them. Let them be excommunicate and accursed with all curses if they do not make amends and render due satisfaction. And know this for truth that after our death no bishop nor count, nor any secular power shall usurp the seigniorship of the blessed St. Giles. And if any presume to attempt it, borne down by all the foregoing curses, they never shall enter the kingdom of heaven, for the blessed St. Giles committed his monastery to the lordship of the blessed Peter.”<sup>4</sup>

Sometimes this facility in cursing descended with ferocity and anatomical particularity to every part of the body, as in the well known curse of Ernulphus quoted in *Tristram Shandy*, where a dozen lines are taken up in a

<sup>4</sup> Lea, “Excommunication,” in “Studies in Church History,” 2 ed. rev. and enl. 1883, 347-8.



list of the members and functions accursed. This excommunication was not intended for murderers and other horrible criminals, but for thieves and such like.<sup>5</sup> I cannot forbear quoting the words of Lea. "Much may be forgiven to men whose profession forbade recourse to force in an age when force was the only law respected; and yet Charity herself might well stand aghast to see those who represented on earth the Gospel of Love unpack their hearts with curses so venomously that they seem enamoured of the opportunity to consign their fellow beings to ruin in this world and to perdition in the next. The clergy themselves by their worldly and too often flagitious lives had forfeited the respect of their flocks (Ratherius of Verona thus explains the habitual disregard of excommunication by the laity of the period,—*De Contemptu Can.* i), and when their censures thus lost effect, it was but natural that they should seek to impress upon sinners by copiousness of malediction the salutary fear which the sacredness of their character could no longer secure. . . . . Hardened sinners might make light of these imprecations; but their effect on believers was necessarily unutterable. When amid the gorgeous and impressive ceremonial of worship, the bishop, surrounded by twelve priests bearing flaming candles, solemnly recited the awful words which consigned the evil doer and all his generation to eternal torment with such fearful amplitude and reduplication of malediction; and, as the sentence of perdition came to its climax, the attending priests simultaneously cast their candles to the ground and trod them out as a symbol of the quenching of human soul in the eternal night of hell. Still greater was the effect when the ingenious expedient was invented of so preparing the candles that they would spontaneously go out at the proper moment, as though extinguished by heaven itself. . . . . Those whom spiritual terrors could not subdue were daunted by the fearful stories of the judgment overtaking the hardened sinner who dared to despise the dread anathema."<sup>6</sup> There was certainly need

<sup>5</sup> See this curse also transl. by Lea, *ib.*, 345-6. *Tristram Shandy*, Sterne, Vol. iii. Ch. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Lea, *Ibid.* 345, 348-9.

of something that would abolish that abuse in the penitential system of the Roman Church, the nightmare of excommunication.

You have noticed how this nightmare fell upon the innocent as well as the guilty. This was especially true of another form of mediaeval penance or punishment, viz., the interdict. This was the cessation of all spiritual privileges to a city or land in order to punish some evil-living or recalcitrant son of the Church. Public worship ceased, no one was married, the dead left unburied, and almost every means of salvation so dear to Catholics was withdrawn. We can hardly imagine a state of things like that, and yet that was the weapon of Holy Mother Church in that century which Professor James J. Walsh, M.D., of Fordham University, New York, calls the Greatest of Centuries, the Thirteenth, 3 ed., 1910, and for centuries before and after. It would be like the action say of all the Protestant pastors of a town, who, to punish the layman who ran off with a woman not his wife, or confiscated some church money, closed all the churches, refused to officiate at marriages or funerals, and shut down every public manifestation of religion. Of course that is a poor comparison, because religion and especially the Church stand now far lower as a means of salvation than then when Church and religion filled almost the whole horizon of life. For all devout and earnest souls what torture of spirit, what ecclesiastical terrorism!

But there were ways by which the Church could fix up those whose sins had offended her but slightly, and upon whom she had imposed penance. If the penances were too heavy and she was in special need of money, the former could be commuted into money payment. In the rules of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, whereas a murderer had to pay from eight to ten years of penance, this time could be shortened by money. Gradually there came to be a regular scale of charge for fixing up each sin and crime by the papal penitentiaries, for the pope found it profitable to set up a regular office or bureau for assessing sins, or rather for assessing the amount of money



to be received for commuting penances imposed for the sins. There has been a controversy whether these charges were the prices of the sins or of the pardons, or whether they were simply the fees for the office work attached to the penitential department of the Church in Rome. If the latter, they would easily pass into the former in popular thought, for the whole penitential system of the Roman Church during the Middle Ages was covered or ever threatened by a fog of venality.

When the Church had imposed penances, that is, usually pilgrimages to holy shrines, prayers, scourgings, good deeds, she allowed these to be changed into money payments for the building of churches, for going on a crusade or holy war, which was the main start of the institution of indulgences, or for other benevolent objects. Such a change was an indulgence. One of the most eminent authorities, Gottlob, thinks that properly an indulgence was not simply such a change or commutation as a transaction between priest and penitent, but was a regular Remission Institute by which high authorities like bishop, cardinal or pope grip in in the course of penance by a proclamation for political or general Church objects. Those for church building or furnishing go back to an indulgence of Pope Sergius IV in November 1011. In the first period, says Gottlob, one could elect *either* reconciliation in the sacrament of penance *or* an indulgence, that is, doing some hard work for the Church, like going on a crusade or a big contribution. Later the indulgence was dovetailed into the penitential scheme, so that it now ran, Reconciliation *and* indulgence. But the indulgence had an easy way of both taking the place of the sacrament of penance (confession to priest and absolution) and doing away with the ordinary penances he imposed, so that the Church was in danger of losing disciplinary grip on her children. The great pope Innocent III therefore made a rule at the Lateran Council of 1215 that every person should confess at least once a year to the priest, a rule that has remained in force till this very day. But that did not hinder the inevitable tendency of the money commutation of penance, that is,

of the indulgence, to amount to an enlargement, that is, a making easier, the old penitential discipline.<sup>7</sup> This commutation of penance was theologically founded by Alexander of Hales about 1230 in a theory so obvious and easy that it is a wonder he was the first Catholic theologian to invent it, viz., the theory that there was a treasury of merits laid up in heaven by saints and martyrs, whose holy lives and heroic deaths did much more than atone for their own sins, not to speak of the superabundant merits of the Virgin Mary and of Christ, and that this vast treasury of merits could be drawn upon by the pope or by those whom he commissioned to go to the credit of poor sinners here in making easier their penance by their purchase of an indulgence.

The question is frequently asked, Did the indulgence cover future sins, either their forgiveness or the remission of their penalty? Yes and no. Everybody knows that according to Roman Catholic theology an indulgence is simply a remission of the penalty or a part of it imposed in the sacrament of penance, but the actual history is much more complicated. Some forms of indulgence went farther and included remission of guilt. Luther's brother Augustinian Johann von Paltz, an indulgence preacher, says of the Jubilee indulgence (about 1502): "By virtue of an indulgence no one, speaking properly, is absolved from punishment and guilt, but only from punishment; for by the sacrament of penance only is there absolution from guilt." He immediately adds: "Nevertheless it is commonly said that in the Jubilee indulgence one is absolved from punishment and guilt." Then he explains: "It is true that a Jubilee is more than a bare indulgence, because it includes the authority of confessing and absolving, and of remitting punishment with this indulgence, and this includes the sacrament of penance and with this an indulgence properly so called. . . And thus (in a Jubilee indulgence) the guilt is remitted by reason of the sacrament of penance, which is there brought in, and the punishment by reason of the indulgence which is

<sup>7</sup> See Gottlob, "Ablassentwicklung u Ablassinhalt im 11 ten Jahrhundert, 1907.



there made use of." It happened therefore that when a big indulgence campaign was on special confessores poenitentiarum were at hand to hear confessions and absolve the buyers of the indulgence, and when thus furnished the buyer had three blessings, freedom from guilt, from penitential satisfaction, and from purgatory.

But the buyer when he was handed the indulgence certificate automatically got these blessings, especially the right to demand then and there absolution from his sins, and if no confessor was near the right to demand it later, which meant absolution for any sin he might commit in the meantime. The Mainz Instruction on indulgence thus describes the virtues of the wares: "The first grace (in this indulgence) is plenary remission of all sin, of which no grace can be greater, by which man a sinner deprived of divine grace comes to it again through that perfect remission and grace of God (in the indulgence), through which remission of sins the punishments in purgatory are fully paid off and remitted." Here the indulgence grace itself is described as a plenary remission of all sins, not simply the old idea of remission of punishment. In conformity with this, bulls in the later Middle Ages described the Jubilee indulgences as the "year of plenary remission and of grace, and reconciliation of the human race to our most pious Redeemer."

Brieger, who studied indulgences so thoroughly, from whom we have two monographs on them, and who, I hope, was able, before he passed away the other day, to finish his larger book on them which he had in preparation, is abundantly justified in saying: "If indulgence as remission of satisfaction was already from the standpoint of mediaeval Christianity an irony on penitential earnestness, a premium on comfortable, lazy, sleepy Christians, for the 'poor beggars of the Church' a means of blessedness upon which the 'perfect', the 'saints', could look down only with a certain despidal (compare the proud word of the monk, 'it is for the religious [monk] not to beg indulgences, but to heap them up'),---in this its last mediaeval stadium of development (when it became an indulgence 'from guilt and punishment') it un-

covers itself in its entirely vicious corruption: the holiest, the grace of God, was here inwoven into a 'holy trade' whose chief impulse was money."<sup>8</sup>

It is thus we understand what drove Luther to his protest namely, that, as he says, "unhappy souls believe, if they buy letters of indulgence, they are certain of their salvation, and also by these indulgences a man is free from all punishment and guilt."<sup>9</sup> And for this reason also in the 95 Theses (see Nos. 5, 20, 34) Luther would know nothing of this later form of indulgence, which he detested so thoroughly, but only of the earlier (to him then more innocent, to us sufficiently frivolous) form of simply a remission of the penalties imposed in the sacrament of penance. In the later form, while it did not distinctly absolve from future sins, it practically amounted to it.

It is no wonder that this bookkeeping scheme of salvation caused searchings of heart among stricter Catholics. Wiclif thought indulgences were blasphemy. "Prelates chatter on the subject of grace as if it were a thing to be bought and sold like an ox; they learn to make merchandise of selling pardons, the devil having availed himself of an error of the schools to introduce heresies in morals. . . Indulgence of the pope are a blasphemy, inasmuch as he claims the power to save almost without limit, and not only to mitigate the penalties of those who have sinned by granting them the aid of absolutions and indulgences, that they should never come to purgatory, but to give command to the angels to carry the soul when separated from the body to everlasting rest."<sup>10</sup> He says that remission of guilt and punishment by an indulgence is a lie and an "abomination of desolation in holy places"; that the Mendicant Friars who further this work in their preaching are enemies of the Church; that they and all cardinals and Englishmen at the papal court which plunder the

<sup>8</sup> See *Indulgenzen* in *Realencyk.* 3 Aufl. ix. 90, to whom I am indebted both for facts and above quotations in Latin.

<sup>9</sup> To Archbishop of Mainz, Oct. 31, 1517, in Enders, "Luther's Briefw." I. 115.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by Buddensieg, "Wiclif Patriot and Reformer, 1884, 125-6.



land thus must restore these illgotten goods if they ever find salvation; and that indulgences have queered the whole western Church.<sup>11</sup>

Nor did they strike Erasmus, the liberal Catholic, much better, though he protested he did not condemn indulgences in themselves. He speaks of those who "venture the whole stress of their salvation on a skin of parchment (indulgence certificate, the so-called 'pardon') rather than upon amendment of life."<sup>12</sup>

"I'll go to the Dominicans, and then I can do my business with the commissaries (of pardons or indulgences) for a trifle.

"What, for sacrilege?

"Ay, if I had robbed Christ himself, and cut off His head afterwards they have pardons which would reach it, and commissions large enough to compound for it."<sup>13</sup>

"To Folly's school are those who think these sins and crimes "can be bought off in this cheap and easy way," so that they have now before them a "clean page of life to fill in with fresh depravities." "<sup>14</sup>

Though the Reformation did not clean out indulgences from the Roman Church, as they were reaffirmed and defended in the Council of Trent (1545-63), it made impossible some of the worst abuses, and lifted away a load of scandal. But the indulgence scheme is too much in harmony with the doctrinal structure of the Church, as well as too profitable, to be entirely abolished, though their sale was done away.

Third, there was the moral need. During the last half of the Middle Ages (say 1200-1500) there was no such reform in the morals of Church and clergy that a description in one part of that period would not be also substantially true of any other. Petrarch lived in the household of a leading prelate of the Church while the popes with

<sup>11</sup> See Lechler, "Johann von Wiclif u d Vogesch. d Reformation," 1873. i. 709.

<sup>12</sup> "Colloquies," Bailey (Johnson) i. 55.

<sup>13</sup> *Ib.* i. 65 (1518, enl. 1526).

<sup>14</sup> "Praise of Folly," Copner's tr. 150 (written 1509, pub. 1511).

their hundreds of ministerial assistants occupied Avignon (1309-77), and his description of the Reverend Fathers from the Vicar of Christ down is none too complimentary. He says:

"There truth is insanity, abstinence is rusticity, modesty a huge disgrace. Thence the extraordinary license of sinning, large-heartedness and liberty, by which the more polluted the life the more distinguished, the more wicked the more of glory, a good name more vile than dirt, and the latest news is of those for sale. I am silent about the artists in both pests, and the negotiators running together to the bedchambers of the popes. Who, I ask, is not mad and mocks at those old men with the white hair, very wide togas and yet verily with lascivious minds so that nothing seems falser than what Maro (Vergil) says, The old man cold toward Venus. In fact so very eager are these white haired old men toward Venus, so much forgetfulness seizes them then as to age and status and strength, thus they burn in lust, they fall into every disgrace, as though all their glory was—not in the Cross of Christ but in feastings and drinkings to excess (*ebriatibus*), and who follow these things in indecencies; and they think this the one reward of old age, to do those things which the young do not dare. . . . I dismiss debaucheries, rapes, incests, adulteries which are the pastimes of pontifical lasciviousness.<sup>15</sup> (Let me quote the Council of Constance's official descriptions of the Christian life of another pope fifty years after, viz., Pope John XXIII, (1415): That the Lord Pope John committed incest with his brother's wife and with holy monialibus, debauchery with virgins, adultery with married women and other crimes of lust, on account of which the wrath of God descends upon children maintained in mistrust. . . . Second, it is said that Lord Pope John was and is a sinful man notoriously criminal in homicide, poisoning and other grave crimes with which it is said deeply ensnared and published abroad, the dissipator of

<sup>15</sup> Lib. sine Titulo Ep. 16, quoted in Latin, Lea, "Hist. Sacredotal Celibacy." 2 ed. 343 n.



the goods of the Church and squanderer of the same, notoriously simonical, obstinately heretical, and notoriously scandalizing the Church of Christ. Third, it is said that Pope John XXIII has frequently and pertinaciously asserted, dogmatized and taught—the devil persuading—that there is no eternal life nor another after this,”<sup>16</sup> etc.

Even granting that there was some exaggeration in this deliberate judgment of the Council, it is a pretty commentary on the need of reformation of a Church which could elect such a man pope in 1410, even if the Council deposed him in 1415, and of whom Erles makes the striking remark that he “was neither better nor worse than his contemporaries.”<sup>17</sup> This is particularly interesting if the remark of his biographer Dietrich is true that while he had the upper hand in Bologna he outraged 200 maids, matrons and widows, including a few nuns. Of Francis Della Rovere, Sixtus IV, pope when Luther was born, a contemporary has these words in a Latin poem: “Voracious pimp, pathie (devotee of unnatural lust), prostitute, informer, adulterer,—if he comes to Rome there he would be seen through. A noted paederast, a furious plunderer, adulterer, the ruin of the city, the pest of God. O old Nero praise, Sixtus surpasses thee in crime, for he at once incloses every wickedness and vice.”<sup>18</sup> He was in the conspiracy to murder Julian and Lorenzo Medici in one of the Churches of Florence, defended the murderers against justice, and laid the country under an interdict to force their acquittal. The pope who reigned when Luther was a child, Cibo (Innocent VIII) was celebrated in the witty sallies of the time as one who had “placed the City Fathers in debt to him because he had restored the city exhausted as to its progeny,”—increased its population, and in an epitaph suggested for his tomb Marullus thus damned him: “In the tomb by which thou art covered, O (Innocent the) Eighth, filth, gluttony, avarice, and lazy sloth lie buried.” It is of this pope that old Chronicler Infessura relates the

<sup>16</sup> Council, Constans. sess 11. See Lea, 344 and notes.

<sup>17</sup> “Dietrich von Nieheim,” 1887, 341, quoted R. E. 3 Aufl. ix. 271.

<sup>18</sup> Steph. Infess. Diar. Rom. ann. 1484, quoted by Lea. 344 n. 2.

horrible story that he attempted to prolong his life by the blood of three boys whose lives were sold for money by their parents, in a potion or transfusion prepared by his Jewish physician. Another chronicler Burkhard is blank in these days, nor does Valori mention it, though Raynaldus knows the tradition, but adds that the pope refused the proposal.

In the year that America was discovered, when Luther was nine years old, the Spaniard Roderick Lanzol who took the name Borja (Ital Borgia) from his mother's brother, Pope Calixtus III, came to the papal throne as Alexander VI, who, with his far worse son, Caesar Borgia, made the name of Borgia forever famous and forever infamous. Modern scholarship is inclined for sufficient reasons to doubt the story of his contemporaries that he was criminally intimate with his own daughter Lucretia, but the very fact that that was the common belief is a sufficient commentary on the state of the papal court on the eve of the Reformation. The Latin Epigrams of Sanazarro unblushingly uncover this side of him. "Wherefore does Alexander always desire thee, Lucretia? O the fate of such an illomened name! And he the father?" "He (Alex. VI) upholds neither human laws, much less divine, nor the gods themselves! so that thus he should permit himself (alas! the wickedness!) patri natae sinum permigere, nor ever carried by fear away from such execrable nuptial acts."<sup>19</sup> Pontanus has an epigram on another side of his activities. "Alexander sells sacraments, altars, Christ. What he has first gained he is able to sell by law." Roderick Lanzol Borgia was highly endowed in person and mind, was eloquent, prudent, an able administrator, knew the better way, but walked not in it. He was one of the handsomest men of his time, swayed women as did Aaron Burr with extraordinary fascination, and deliberately chose the path of voluptuousness. All his children born both before and after his elevation to the tiara were legitimated and bore his own name. Not the slightest

<sup>19</sup> Sanazarro, "Epigr. ii; Lea 345 note.



shame was felt by any one concerned. He had indeed his chief paramour Vanozza married to three men successively, but this was done as a mere form, as they did not live with her, and everybody understood that her children were his. She lived in a house adjoining his wonderfully beautiful and sumptuous palace. By the time he became pope Vanozza's charms were beginning to wane, and he installed another mistress, Julia Farnese, whose brother many years later became Pope Paul III.

Alexander VI flung benefices to his children and relatives with lavish hand. "The Borgias, the Lenzuolis, and whatever else the swarming branches of this race of Aragonese hidalgos may have been called, now flooded Rome. 'Ten popedom,' says a contemporary, 'would not satisfy the greediness of this clan.' For the eleven years of his pontificate Alexander held everything else subordinate to the one thought of building up a mighty house of Borgia that should take a permanent place among the potentates of Italy and Europe. Had he lived a few years longer, it is possible that his race might have become kings of middle Italy, reducing the immediate dominion of the Church (the Church lands or states) to the patrimony of St. Peter. Alexander at once made over the archbishop of Valencia and its 16,000 ducats to his son Caesar, who as much excelled his father in wickedness as his father excelled common men. His nephew he made cardinal. Alexander was the absolute type of the purely natural man, in an age in which the natural man, above all in Italy, was supreme."<sup>20</sup>

The infamous reputation of the Borgia prelates has made some Catholic apologists of recent times try to disinfect this nauseating memory. A very fair judge of Catholicism speaks of these defenders as busy nobodys swarming like vermin around the history of popes of evil repute, in the hope of nibbling away here a scandal and there a scandal.<sup>21</sup> But sober historians of that Church

<sup>20</sup> C. C. Starbuck, "The Real Borgia," in *The Methodist Rev.*, N. Y., March 1898, 239.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 236.

have not hesitated to speak the truth. The eminent cardinal Hergenröther may be taken as a specimen. He calls Alexander immoral and vicious, hesitating at no means, master of expediency—politics, with a thoroughly bad past, begat several children in adultery, lived only for the satisfaction of his lusts and the enrichment of his children, and kept up that kind of life long after he came to the papal throne. Even though many of his transgressions are invented by his enemies, enough remain to hold his memory in moral abomination. All moral conscience failed in one so worldly and voluptuous.<sup>22</sup>

When Alexander VI died Luther was twenty. Yes, it was time. There was need of the Reformation.

*Drew Theological Seminary,  
Madison, N. J.*

<sup>22</sup> "Kirchengeschichte" ii. 130 2 Aufl. See also the following Roman Catholic historians: Funk, K. G., 4 Aufl., 1902, 381; Kraus, K. G., 2 Aufl., 538-540; Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters, 2 Aufl., 1895, iii. 271-502, esp. 279-90, 534-4, 449-52, 472-5; Reumont, in Wetzler and Welte, 2 Aufl. i. 483, 487-8.



## ARTICLE III.

## THE LITURGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY REV. R. MORRIS SMITH, PH.D., D.D.

(Note.—The compilation of the following article demanded no great amount of general liturgical knowledge. The two prime requisites were,—a file of the Minutes of the General Synod, and patience. The former was placed at the writer's service through the courtesy of Miss Grace Prince, Librarian of the Zimmerman Library, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio; the latter he exercised to the full measure of his ability. In many instances reports could have been considerably condensed, but the writer preferred to permit the Minutes to convey the history in their own language. Kindnesses shown by the Rev. Dr. J. A. Singmaster, Gettysburg Seminary, and the Rev. Luther D. Reed, D.D., Mt. Airy Seminary, are hereby acknowledged).

At a meeting of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, held in Harrisburg, Pa., in 1818, it was "*Resolved*, That the Synod thinks it were desirable if the various Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the United States were to stand in some way or another in closer connection with each other, and that the venerable Ministerium be charged to consider this matter, to prepare a plan for a closer union, if the venerable Ministerium deem it advisable, and to see to it that this union, if it be desirable, be brought about, if possible."<sup>1</sup> At a subsequent Ministerial session the following action was taken: "*Resolved*, That the officers of Synod shall contribute a corresponding committee, to bring about, wherever practicable, a union with the other Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the United States."<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Documentary History of Pa. Ministerium, p. 517.

<sup>2</sup> Doc. Hist. of Pa. Min., p. 522.

1819 Convention of the Synod of Pennsylvania met in Baltimore, Md. Two letters, evidently received by the corresponding committee, were placed before the Ministerium,—“one from Mr. Gottl. Schober, of North Carolina, and one from Mr. Quitman, of New York, in which they express the desire for a closer union of the Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the United States.”

“*Resolved*, That Dr. Schaefer, Dr. Kurz and Pastors Lochman and Endress, from among the preachers, and Messrs. Demuth, Keller, and Schorr, from among the delegates, shall constitute a committee to consider, together with Mr. Gottl. Schober, the matter of such a union of the Synods, and as soon as possible to draft a plan for this purpose.”<sup>3</sup> The Minutes specifically record the fact that “Mr. Gottl. Schober, of North Carolina, and Secretary of the Ministerium of that State, presented his credentials as a delegate of their Synod, and received a seat and vote among us.”<sup>4</sup> It appears that Mr. Schober had already prepared a “Plan”<sup>5</sup> which formed the basis of discussion. After the Committee had submitted its report, a vote was taken and “it was found that there were forty-two for the General Synod, and eight against the same.”<sup>6</sup> This proposed “Plan” was to be submitted to all Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the United States as a basis for a general organization. Upon its adoption by three-fourths of these different Synods, the President of the Synod of Pennsylvania, was to designate the time when and the place where this General Synod was to be held. A sufficient number of Synods having favorably considered the “Plan,” the Rev. Dr. J. G. Schmucker, President of the Synod of Pennsylvania, published Hagerstown, Md., as the place and October 22nd, 1820, as the time for this Convention. At this meeting the General Synod was organized.

The fourth item of this “proposed plan” reads as follows:—“The General Synod has the exclusive right with

3 Doc. Hist., p. 528.

4 Doc. Hist., p. 527.

5 Ev. Review, Vol. V:240.

6 Doc. Hist., p. 538.



the concurrence of a majority of the particular Synods to introduce new books for general use in the public Church Service as well as to make improvements in the Liturgy; but until this be done the hymn-books or collections of hymns now in use, the Small Catechism of Luther, the Agenda already adopted, and such other books as have been adopted by the existing Synods shall continue in public use at pleasure.”<sup>7</sup>

The delegates present at this meeting agreed upon a Constitution, which was to be referred to the various Synods for ratification, and if three of the Synods represented adopted the Constitution the Chairman was commissioned to convene the General Synod at Frederick, Md., on the fourth Monday in October, 1821. Three of the then existing Synods having approved the Constitution, the first meeting of the General Synod was held at Frederick, Md., Oct. 22nd, 1821. Matters of greater importance than the liturgies in use in the different District Synods claimed the attention of the general body, and hence we find no reference in the Minutes of the First (1821) and of the Second (1823) Conventions of the General Synod. But at the Third Convention, which again met at Frederick, Md., Oct. 1825, we find the following among its proceedings: “*Resolved*, That Dr. J. G. Schmucker, Rev. G. Schober, B. Keller, S. S. Schmucker, and C. P. Krauth, be a committee to prepare a Hymn-Book, Liturgy, and a collection of Prayers in the English language, for the use of our Church, adhering particularly to the New York Hymn Book, and German Liturgy of Pennsylvania, as their guides; and that they report thereon to the next General Synod.” (Mins. 1825, p. 9). With the Hymn-Book referred to in this resolution we are not here concerned; and only in a casual way is it necessary to say that the “German Liturgy of Pennsylvania” to which the Committee was to adhere as a guide was that of 1818. A description of this Liturgy would be here in place, had the instructions been carried out; but the Committee came to the Fourth Convention of the

7 Doc. Hist., p. 542.

General Synod, which met at Gettysburg, Pa., in Oct. 1827, offered a report on the Hymn-Book but so far as the Liturgy was concerned, it was "*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Hymn-Book and Liturgy have leave to report on the Liturgy, at the next meeting of this Synod." (Mins. 1827, p. 9). An oppressive liturgical silence characterizes the Minutes of "the next meeting of this Synod," which was held at Hagerstown, Md., in Oct. 1829. Four years before, the Committee had been given definite instructions as to a Liturgy; but these instructions went unheeded. When the General Synod met in its Sixth Convention, at Frederick, Md., in Oct 1831, the action touching a Liturgy, is expressed in the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That this Synod will cheerfully encourage, by its sanction. . . . . A Liturgy in the English language having reference to the works of this kind now used in different parts of our Church." (Mins. 1831, pp. 7-8). On page 19, in the pastoral address appended we are informed that the General Synod had resolved to prepare and publish certain works, among them being "A Liturgy for the use of our Church in the United States to be added to another edition of our Hymn-Book, which is soon to be published at Baltimore, in a larger type than that which has hitherto been used." Between that which was only *anticipatory* in the "cheerful encouragement, by its sanction" which the General Synod would give to a Liturgy and the *definite* announcement that a Liturgy would be prepared and "added to another edition of our Hymn-Book, which is soon to be published," the General Synod took a long step. How swelled with rapturous emotion must have been the hearts of our dear brethren of the past as they daily anticipated scanning this many-years-awaited Liturgy! How crest-fallen and sadly disappointed must have been those same hearts as they actually turned the pages of this longed-for liturgical product!

#### THE LITURGY OF 1832.

Some time between the General Synod Conventions of 1831 and 1833, the Hymn-Book with the appended Lit-



urgy appeared. This was in the year 1832. At the Seventh meeting of the General Synod, held in Baltimore, Md., in 1833, the editing committee reported,—“That agreeably to the directions of the last General Synod they had the Hymn-Book published in an 8vo form with the Liturgy.” (Mins. 1833, p. 13). Dr. S. S. Schmucker, of the Book Committee, reported,—“That agreeably to the directions of said body (G. S.) they delineated a plan for the several works ordered and notified the brethren elected by the Synod to undertake the labor. The following works have already been issued from the press: 1. The large edition of the Hymn-Book together with the Liturgy, which was prepared by the Rev. Mr. Lintner. The Liturgy was perused by the Book Committee and sanctioned by them.” (Mins. 1833, p. 17). Among the names of the Committee appointed in 1825 to prepare a Hymn-Book, Liturgy and a Collection of Prayers, the name of the Rev. Mr. Lintner does not appear. Neither is there any record in the Minutes that this Committee had been discharged, and a new one appointed. However in 1831 the General Synod determined to elect by ballot fifteen clergymen as an *Editing Committee* to prepare the works sanctioned by the Synod. The Rev. Mr. Lintner was one of this Committee. Whenever any member of the Committee had completed the portion of work assigned him, he submitted the same to the *Book Committee* for examination. The Book Committee consisted of the Rev. Drs. S. S. Schmucker, D. F. Schaeffer, J. G. Morris, J. G. Schmucker, and E. L. Hazelius. If a majority of this Committee approved any submitted work, the author was empowered to have it published under the sanction of the General Synod. This explains the report submitted by Dr. Schmucker. The Rev. Mr. Lintner had evidently been charged with the preparation of this Liturgy, and he did it in a manner satisfactory to the Book Committee.

What was this Liturgy? What were its chief characteristics? Only last April (1917) was the writer fortunate enough to find a copy of this Liturgy in an old book

store in Baltimore. The title page reads: "A Liturgy for the use of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Published by order of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. Baltimore: Published by Lucas and Deaver, No. 19 S. Calvert Street, 1832." The Liturgy proper consists of twelve (12) Sections distributed over 31 pages.

Section I. is divided into (1) A form of Confession and Prayer which may be used at the Commencement of public worship. (2) Another form of a general prayer which may be used before Sermon. (3) Prayer which may be used after Sermon. (4) Benediction for the conclusion of public worship.

Section II. The Ministration of Baptism to Infants.

Section III. The Ministration of Baptism to Adult Persons.

Section IV. Of Confirmation.

Section V. Form of Preparation for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Section VI. Administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Section VII. The Solemnization of Matrimony.

Section VIII. The Inauguration of Elders and Deacons.

Section IX. The Burial of the Dead.

Section X. Form for the Consecration of a Church.

Section XI. Form of Licensing Candidates for the Ministry of the Gospel.

Section XII. Form of Ordaining Ministers of the Gospel.

Twelve years had the General Synod resolved and waited for this Liturgy. The judgment of the brethren of the General Synod as to its merits, is reflected, I think, in the action taken at the next Convention, York, Pa., in June 1835. A letter was presented "from the vestry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Trappe, Montgomery county, Pa. This church is one of the oldest in the United States and appears much attached to the cause of our Lutheran Zion. The members desire that the Liturgy



and Prayers of the New York Hymn-Book be appended to the Hymn-Book of the General Synod." "The Liturgy and Prayers of the New York Hymn-Book" referred to by the Church at Trappe, Pa., were those that had recently (1834) appeared in the revised edition of the New York Synod's "Hymn-Book and Liturgy." The Committee to whom this letter was referred suggested "that a Committee be appointed to prepare a series of Prayers to be appended to the General Synod Hymn-Book and to amend the forms in the *present Liturgy*." The suggestion of the Committee resulted in the following action: "*Resolved*, That a Committee of seven clerical members be appointed to prepare a series of prayers to be appended to the Hymn-Book of the General Synod, and to amend the forms in the present Liturgy; and the said Committee is hereby requested to report as soon as practicable to the Book Committee, which, if a majority approve, shall be immediately put to press." Committee: Rev. D. F. Schaeffer, J. G. Morris, J. Bachman, Prof. Krauth, E. Keller, J. Z. Senderling, Samuel Rothrock. It was further "*Resolved*, That the prayers be appended to our Hymn-Book, of whatever size the edition may be, but that the Liturgy be appended to the large Hymn-Book." (Mins. 1835, pp. 12-13). This action plainly indicates that the whole conception of a Liturgy was restricted practically to a series of forms commonly known as "Ministerial Acts." That the congregation should assume an active part in worship beyond merely the singing of hymns; or, that worship should assume a responsive character, was a liturgical conception that did not at this period dominate the General Synod.

When the General Synod met at Hagerstown, Md., in June 1837, the Committee on Unfinished Business called attention to the resolution of the preceding meeting, whereupon it was "*Resolved*, That this resolution be referred to a Committee of three to report whether any, and what further action is necessary on this subject." Committee: Rev. Dr. Hazellius, Rev. J. G. Morris, and Rev. J. N. Hoffman. At a subsequent session this Com-

mittee reported as follows: "The Committee appointed to report on the proposed alterations in the Liturgy beg leave to recommend to Synod, That the Standing Committee appointed at the last session of the General Synod be continued and that they report at the next meeting the result of their labors." This motion was temporarily tabled; but at the fourth session it was again taken up and after some debate, it was "*Resolved*, That this report be given over to a Committee of two to report during the present session whether any further action is necessary on this subject." Committee: Rev. C. F. Schaeffer, and B. Keller. This Committee at once retired for deliberation and subsequently reported the following: "The Committee appointed to consider the subject of the Liturgy, beg leave to report as the result of their deliberations the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, 1st, That the Committee of seven mentioned in resolution 20 of the 8th Convention of the General Synod examine the Liturgy and Prayers of the New York Hymn-Book, and if they find *the last edition* to meet the wants of the Church, that they report to the Book Committee their approval of the same.

"*Resolved*, 2nd, That the Book Committee on receiving such a communication take proper measures to append said Liturgy and Prayers to our Hymn-Book." Signed, Chas. F. Schaeffer, Benj. Keller. This report was received and adopted and these two brethren were named as members of the Standing Committee to fill vacancies caused by death.

When the General Synod met in its Tenth Convention in June 1839, at Chambersburg, Pa., "the Committee on the Liturgy reported progress and obtained leave to co-operate with the Committee of the Synod of Pennsylvania on the same subject in preparing a uniform Liturgy for the use of the Church." The "last edition" of the New York Synod's Liturgy evidently did *not* "meet the wants of the Church."

In 1841 the General Synod convened in Baltimore, Md. We are surprised to find ourselves confronted with a



“minority” report, as follows: “The undersigned, the only members of the Liturgical Committee which could be conveniently consulted, beg leave to report—That action on their part in regard to the duties assigned has been impeded and that their labors have failed of consummation from various causes; amongst them may be mentioned the feeling on the part of some that the Liturgy already prepared and published by the Synod could not be displaced without serious inconvenience. In addition, the extensive introduction and use of liturgies in different parts of the Church they regarded as a great obstacle. The understanding, too, that their labors should be connected with those of the Committee appointed for a similar purpose by the Synod of Pennsylvania, precluded action till it was known what would be the result of the labors of that Committee. These not yet having been known, it was impracticable to undertake anything which should have reference to their work. Under these circumstances the Committee would advise the relinquishment of the matter by the General Synod and acquiescence in existing formularies and arrangements.” Signed, John G. Morris, C. P. Krauth. (Mins. 1841, p. 11). The resolution in favor of the adoption of this report was lost. The Committee appointed to examine the Minutes of the Synod of Pennsylvania of 1840, reported: “This Synod (Penna.) by resolution, appointed the use of the Liturgy of the Synod of New York in their English churches, hoping that the General Synod will adopt said Liturgy and uniformity in our Church be thus secured and promoted.” The “minority” report having failed of adoption, at the closing session of this Convention, it was “*Resolved*, That the Committee appointed to prepare a Liturgy for the use of our churches be re-instructed to prepare such a Liturgy as in their view shall answer the purpose intended, and present it at the next meeting.” (Mins. 1841, p. 22). We are now approaching a new era in the liturgical history of the General Synod inasmuch as the year 1843 marked the beginning of a movement which culminated in

## THE LITURGY OF 1847.

The Twelfth Convention of the General Synod was held again in Baltimore, Md., in 1843. The subject of the Liturgy was introduced in the following manner: "Prof. W. M. Reynolds offered the following preamble and resolution: "Whereas, Uniformity in public worship is highly desirable, and the introduction of a good Liturgy is well calculated to accomplish this object, and as the German Liturgy prepared by the Synods of Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, answers this purpose, therefore *Resolved*, That we recommend said Liturgy to the Synods in our connection, and that a Committee of seven be appointed for the purpose of forming an English Liturgy upon the basis of the said German Liturgy." This led to the following action: *Resolved*, That the subject embraced in the foregoing resolution be referred to a Committee consisting of one from each District Synod with the instructions to report to-morrow morning." Committee: Rev. E. Keller, Chairman; S. S. Schmucker, Senderling, P. A. Strobel, N. Pohlman, Eichelberger, Yeager, J. B. Reck, Babb, Prof. Reynolds.

The Rev. L. Eichelberger read the report of this Committee at a subsequent session. It reads thus: "The Committee to whom was referred the subject of the publication of a new Liturgy and the facts and statements made to Synod relative to the merits of the several liturgical forms, both German and English now in use in the Church have had the same under consideration and respectfully recommend to Synod the adoption of the following resolutions on the subject:

*Resolved*, That uniformity in public worship and in the forms and ceremonies proper to be used in the Church in conducting among us the various exercises of religion, can only be secured by providing for the use of the Church a Liturgy that by its superior merits shall receive the sanction of the Church at large.

*Resolved*, That this Synod regard the German Liturgy of the Synod of Pennsylvania as suitable for adoption



among our German Churches generally, and hereby accordingly recommend it.

*“Resolved, That Rev. Dr. Krauth, Rev. Henry I. Smith, Rev. Prof. Reynolds, Rev. Dr. Morris, Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, Rev. Chas. A. Smith, and Rev. E. Keller, be a Committee whose duty it shall be to prepare a Liturgy in the English language, having a reference to the German Liturgy of the Synod of Pennsylvania, as the basis of the same, as well as other liturgical forms now in use in the Church.*

*“Resolved, That 500 copies of said Liturgy be printed under the directions of the Committee and a copy be sent to each minister connected with the General Synod for examination until the next General Synod with a view to deliberate and final action on that occasion.”* Signed by the above-named Committee. This report was adopted.

We are next led forward to May 1845, the date of the Thirteenth Convention of the General Synod in Philadelphia, Pa. At an opportune time the Liturgical Committee appointed at the last Convention offered their report: “At an early period after the adjournment of Synod, they took steps to accomplish the work assigned them, in accordance with the directions of Synod. The first step was to divide it among the different members of the Committee. Each member received his share and performed the task assigned him. The plan was to translate the Liturgy of the Pennsylvania Synod and to make such omissions or admissions as each translator deemed advisable. After the whole was completed, it was furnished to the agent of the Book Company, by him printed for the use of the ministers, and sent to them. It is due to the Committee to state that the printing was done so hastily and with so little consultation of them that no opportunity was furnished of attending to accuracy in the printing, and an exceedingly imperfect edition was furnished the Church. In some instances the errors were so great as entirely to disfigure the sense, and the whole was calculated to make an unfavorable impression on the reader.

It is now sent to Synod with corrections made by the Committee in a careful revision, and various suggestions

from Synods and individuals. It is hoped that the Synods will, if it should be adopted, take especial care that it be not sent out to the Church in a form less elegant and accurate than the original.

The Committee deem it proper to state that the Liturgy in its present form possesses advantages, which no other, presented to the Church in the English language does. It is not claimed for it, that it is a more finished composition, or that it breathes a more evangelical spirit than others—but it is in these respects not exceptional. Its language may not possess the finish or fluency of an original composition; this is always necessarily the result of a translation from the German, unless great freedom is allowed; but it is sufficiently pure and idiomatic for the purposes for which it is designed, and its spirit is not only evangelical and Lutheran in an eminent degree, but in addition conveyed extensively in the very words of the Holy Ghost. The advantages which we claim for this Liturgy are:

1. It is more full than any other English Liturgy; it embraces more religious solemnities; indeed makes provision for all that have ever been regarded as sacred in this country.

2. It is pre-eminently the Liturgy of the American Lutheran Church springing from that portion of it which is the mother of us all and still held in high veneration by the earliest Churches of our connection, it deserves to be transmitted with our growing Zion in the United States in the various changes she may undergo.

3. If uniformity be desirable, it will be secured by the adoption of these forms. Whether we worship in the German or in the English language we will hear the pastor as he appears before the altar, utter the same truths and address us in the same manner, and pour forth before the Hearer of Prayer the same supplications.

4. It is not probable that the Church could be induced to receive another Liturgy with as much favor as this, simply because no other can present the same historical



recollections, and be accompanied with so many interesting associations.

5. A large portion of the Church, viz, the Synods of Pennsylvania, and Ohio, as well as the General Synod, having already adopted the German Liturgy, there seems to be a manifest necessity or at least a very strong call for a work not merely of the same kind, but as near as may be, the very same, in the English language." Signed: C. P. Krauth, B. Kurtz, W. M. Reynolds, Ezra Keller, John G. Morris, Chas. A. Smith.

The report was received and temporarily laid on the table. When later it was again taken up for consideration, it evidently provoked considerable discussion, and "it was on motion, *Resolved*, That the report of the Liturgical Committee and the resolutions, substitutes &c., now on the table be referred to the Committee on the State of the Church, to report some plan of action to-morrow morning." (Mins. 1845, p. 40). The Rev. Chas A. Smith, a member of the Liturgical Committee, was also a member of the Committee on the State of the Church and it was he who presented the report:

"The Committee upon the State of the Church to whom was referred the report of the Liturgical Committee, the Liturgy as revised by them, and the several propositions that were made in Synod relative to this matter, respectfully report: That they have given the subject a very careful examination and arrived at the following conclusions:

1. That the Liturgy is upon the whole such a work as the wants of the Church demand, though it needs a thorough revision by a single hand in order to secure unity of style and the highest literary excellence.

2. That no material changes can be made in it without endangering its acceptability and usefulness in the Church, and exposing us to the inconsistency of having two entirely different Liturgies, the one for our German and the other for our English members. In order to meet these difficulties they propose:

- (a) That the original forms of the New York Liturgy

with such improvements as are suggested by the translation, be substituted for the latter; that the first form of the New York Confessions be inserted in the place of the Second, and that other approved forms of the New York Liturgy be inserted where thought desirable, provided the size of the work be not too much increased thereby; to which end only one form shall be given for the less usual festival services.

(b) That the Liturgical Committee be continued and that each member of it be allowed to revise his work, after which the whole shall be given into the hands of Prof. H. I. Smith, of Hartwick Seminary, for general revisal, in which he shall have reference to the changes that have been or may be suggested by Synods or by individuals, but shall make no important changes of forms or of ideas that are not unanimously approved by the Committee."

This report was received and together with its suggestions adopted. It was then "*Resolved*, That as soon as the revised copies of the Liturgy can be finished, one copy be furnished to the Secretary of each of the District Synods, and that said Synods be recommended to examine the same and to instruct their delegates to the General Synod as to the course they are to pursue." (Mins. 1845, p. 42).

We are next informed that "the report of the Liturgical Committee presented yesterday was now taken up and adopted with the exception of a concluding recommendation which was stricken out."

Three years elapsed before the next Convention of the General Synod. Some time during the fall preceding, in the year 1847, this Liturgy was published, and when the General Synod met in its Fourteenth Convention in New York City, May 1848, Prof. H. I. Smith offered the report of the Liturgical Committee as follows:

"Your Committee on the Liturgy would respectfully say that after the action taken by the last General Synod relative to the work entrusted to them, there is but little for them to report. The last Convention, after adopting the Liturgy, gave it into the hands of the Chairman of the



Committee in order that he might give it uniformity of style. The individual charged with this important duty, endeavored to perform it to the best of his ability, by entirely retranslating the whole work, with the exception of a few pages, when it was again submitted to the inspection of all members of the Committee with the exception of one whose remoteness rendered it unavoidable to transmit the Ms. to him. The work has now been about nine months before the Church and several District Synods have approved it, and introduced it in their churches.

"In pursuance of a resolution, adopted at the last meeting of the General Synod 500 copies have been printed....

"Your Committee would further recommend that a Standing Committee on the Liturgy be appointed, whose duty it shall be, whenever a new edition shall be called for, to direct and superintend its publication, and to make such corrections, additions, and improvements as may be necessary, or ordered by Synod.

"Praying for the blessing of God upon the work which they have now completed, they leave all further action in the matter to the Synod, respectfully submitting this as their final report." Signed: H. I. Schmidt, Chairman; Wm. M. Reynolds, C. A. Smith, B. Kurtz, C. P. Krauth, Sr., John G. Morris.

The following action on the report was taken:

*"Resolved*, That the report be adopted.

*"Resolved*, That in conformity to the resolution of the last General Synod, a copy of the new Liturgy be sent to the Synods in connection with this body and that said Synods be recommended to examine the same and to give an expression of their views to the General Synod through their delegates.

*"Resolved*, That the adoption of this Liturgy be recommended to our Churches, and that the Committee be continued and directed to carry out the suggestions of the report, and to make such other improvements as this body may from time to time regard as necessary."

On another page of the Minutes we are informed that

the thanks of the Synod were extended to the Rev. H. I. Schmidt for the care and ability displayed in the translation, as well as to the other members of the Committee for their co-operation in the work. Also that each member of the Committee be presented with an "elegantly bound" copy of the Liturgy containing an inscription of these sentiments.

The Liturgy of 1847 was an improvement over that of 1832, but it was still wonderfully far removed from what the General Synod attained to in its so-called "Washington Service," and more recently in "The Common Service."

The writer possesses a copy of this Liturgy and a brief description may not prove uninteresting to the reader. The title page reads thus: "A Liturgy For the Use of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Published by Order of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. Baltimore: Printed at the Publication Rooms of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, No. 7, South Liberty Street, 1847," The "Preface," covering four and a half pages and signed by the Committee, contains many excellent suggestions as to the value and advantages of a Liturgy. There is also subjoined "a brief statement of the manner in which the work was produced." On the page devoted to the "Services for the Lord's Day" we have the following:

"The usual Order of Service for the morning of the Lord's Day is as follows:

"The minister rises and pronounces a benediction, or some other devotional passage of Scripture, and then gives out the hymn that is to be sung. After the singing he goes to the altar, and calls upon the congregation to confess their sins, or reads one of the general prayers for Sunday. The prayer is followed by the reading of a portion of Scripture, such as the Gospels, the Epistles, or some other suitable passage. After this the minister announces a hymn adapted to his sermon, and whilst it is sung, ascends the pulpit. After the close of the hymn he prays, preaches, and prays again; whereupon the con-



gregation, having sung another hymn, is dismissed with the benediction.

"Under ordinary circumstances the sermon should not exceed three-quarters of an hour in length. In the afternoon and evening service the prayer and reading of the Scriptures at the altar may be omitted. . . . The Lord's Prayer should be frequently used, but not oftener than once during the same meeting. . . ."

The matter is divided into fourteen (14) Sections, furnishing ample material for carrying out the minister's part, both in the conduct of the Lord's Day Service as well as all *Acts* covering his usual duties. The only part the congregation has lies in the hymn. This being the case, we are not at all surprised to find this wholesome advice: "Efforts should be made to improve the singing in the church as much as possible." The book contains 184 pages besides two and a half pages of "Contents."

"The Liturgical Question," however, was not settled. When the General Synod met in its Fifteenth Convention in 1850 at Charleston, S. C., the Liturgical Committee reported, but *what* the Minutes do not inform. Sometimes disagreeable subjects are readily disposed of by a motion to "lay on the table." Thus was it in this instance. It was, however, "*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Liturgy be continued." We also learn that "various suggestions on the subject of the Liturgy were then made by members of different Synods." One of the Synods connected with the General Synod had a carefully prepared report which its delegates submitted. We here present it in full:

#### "REPORT OF THE MARYLAND SYNOD'S DELEGATION ON THE LITURGY."

"The Committee appointed by the Maryland Synod to report suggestions on the improvements to be made in the next edition of the Liturgy, beg leave to offer the following:

1. To introduce the Ten Commandments before the first form of Confession, and the Apostle's Creed after it.
2. To retain but one form for Infant Baptism, Preparatory Service, The Lord's Prayer and Marriage.
3. To prepare a suitable address to Catechumens before Confirmation and another after it.
4. To insert the Confirmation questions of the old Liturgy.
5. To prepare a suitable address to be used before proposing the questions to the communicants at preparatory service.
6. To insert the questions of the Maryland Synod's Constitution at the end of the form for installation.
7. To prepare two forms appropriate to the burial of children and youth in addition to the general one now in the Liturgy.
8. To insert the passages of Scripture which point out the Gospels and Epistles to be read during the Church Year.
9. To insert Family Prayers for one week and a few for special occasions.
10. To prepare a form for the organization of new Churches."

Signed: J. G. Morris, S. Sentman, J. A. Seiss, F. W. Conrad.

The whole matter was disposed of so far as this Convention was concerned when it was "*Resolved*, That the various suggestions for the improvement of the new Liturgy, that have been made by the District Synods to this Synod be referred to the Standing Committee on the Liturgy, and that those Synods which are not now prepared to report be requested to present their recommendations to said Committee at the earliest convenience."

The suggestions submitted by the Maryland Synod afford a partial glimpse of what a difficult task confronted the Liturgical Committee. The Committee was not in the least reticent in expressing itself on the subject as they did at the Sixteenth Convention, Winchester, Va., 1853. The following report was read by Prof. H. I. Schmidt:



"The Standing Committee on the Liturgy would respectfully report that since the last meeting of the General Synod various attempts have been made to make such alterations and improvements in the Liturgy published by this body, and to introduce such additional formulas as would meet the views and wishes frequently expressed in divers quarters of the Church; but that in these views and wishes they have found so much diversity, and so many irreconcilable differences, that they have given up the hope of accomplishing anything that would at the present time be satisfactory to the Church; and further that as the General Synod has desired that our English Liturgy should be substantially the same as the German Liturgy, published by the Synods of Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, and adopted by this body; and as those Synods are now subjecting the German Liturgy to a thorough revision, it is, at present impossible to bring our English into conformity with the German Liturgy, or at least to harmonize the two as completely as possible; and, therefore desirable to wait until that revision is completed and the new German Liturgy published.

In view of these facts and circumstances your Committee now beg to be discharged." Respectfully submitted: H. I. Schmidt, Chas. A. Smith, John G. Morris, B. Kurtz.

Considerable discussion was provoked by this report, but it was finally "*Resolved*, That the Liturgical Committee be continued and that they examine the Liturgy which is being prepared by the Pennsylvania and other Synods, with the view of reporting to the next General Synod such alterations in our present Liturgy as they may deem advisable."

We are further informed that "Rev. Drs. Schmucker, and Sprecher were appointed to fill vacancies in this Committee which now consists of Rev. Drs. H. I. Schmidt, S. S. Schmucker, S. Sprecher and C. P. Krauth."

The success of this Committee approximated that of the previous meeting. In 1855, the General Synod assembled at Dayton, Ohio. The Minutes inform us that

the "Rev. A. T. Geissenhainer presented an elegantly bound copy of the German Liturgy, recently adopted by the Pennsylvania Synod, in the name of that body. It was received, and Synod returned its grateful acknowledgments for the favor conferred." This was the Liturgy to which the Committee referred in their report at the previous meeting. Again the Minutes do *not* inform us *what* the Liturgical Committee reported. We are apprised that "the report was accepted and after considerable discussion was referred back to the Committee with the additional resolution: "That one member from each Synod not yet represented in the Liturgical Committee be added to it, the member to be chosen by the delegation present from that Synod, to consider the whole subject. This Committee was subsequently filled by the nomination of the following brethren: Rev. Dr. Bachman, S. C. Synod; Rev. Mr. Rothrock, N. C. Synod; Prof. Sternberg, Hartwick Synod; Rev. C. P. Krauth, Jr., Virginia Synod; Rev. L. Knight, Allegheny Synod; Rev. Dr. Stork, East Pennsylvania Synod; Prof. M. Diehl, Miami Synod; Rev. Dr. Sprecher, Wittenberg Synod; Rev. W. G. Keil, English Synod of Ohio; Prof. Springer, Illinois Synod; Rev. Dr. Bittle, West Virginia Synod; Rev. D. Jenkins, Southwest Synod; Prof. Conrad, Olive Branch Synod; Dr. C. F. Schaeffer, Pennsylvania Synod; Dr. Harkey, Northern Illinois Synod; Dr. W. A. Passavant, Pittsburgh Synod; Rev. Mr. Wendt, Texas Synod; Rev. A. J. Weddel, English District Synod of Ohio; Rev. D. Harbaugh, Kentucky Synod; Rev. J. F. Williams, Central Synod of Pennsylvania." It was also "*Resolved*, That a pocket edition of the General Synod's English Liturgy, now in use, be published by the Liturgical Committee, to meet present wants, provided that it shall not involve any outlay on the part of this body."

We cannot refrain from introducing at this point the words of Dr. Wm. M. Reynolds in writing of this meeting: "The Liturgical Committee having recommended the correction of the liturgical forms by the Synod, and the issue of a new edition, the liturgical question was



taken up, and gave rise to expressions of opinion, various in their character. It seemed to be conceded that the General Synod's Liturgy does not meet the wants of the Church. In view of this fact, and that the General Synod, after the labor of many years, had reached no satisfactory result, it was the judgment of some that the whole matter should be relinquished, and left to District Synods, several of which already have liturgies of their own in use.

On the other hand, it was replied, that the Synod having devoted so much time and labor to this work, ought not to abandon it, that a successful issue was not impossible, and that a general liturgy, for the sake of uniformity, to be used in all our churches, was highly desirable. It was further urged that the Pennsylvania Synod having completed, after immense labor, its liturgy, it might be employed in meeting the defects of the General Synod's book. . . . . *To us it appears, that the conviction is extending itself more and more, that our Church is liturgical, that such forms ought to constitute a part of our public worship, and that there should be uniformity in their use. Difficulties are, doubtless, in the way, but prudence and moderation will, we think, overcome them.*"<sup>8</sup> The italics are ours. Interpreted in the light of to-day this language was prophetic.

The result of the instructions to have a "pocket edition" issued we have before us in what is practically

#### THE LITURGY OF 1856.

This differs only in minor points from that of 1847. The writer possesses a copy of this edition, and the only differences noted are the following: The publisher is T. Newton Kurtz instead of "Publication Rooms"; the "Table of Contents" is brought from the end of the book to the beginning; the "Preface" omits the statement as to the manner in which the Liturgy was produced; the name of Ezra Keller is added to the Committee; under

8 Evangelical Review., Vol. VII:128ff.

the heading, "Services for the Lord's Day," the last sentence with reference to "Choral Singing" is omitted; the following "Preface to the Smaller Edition" is inserted: "In the following edition of the Liturgy, the Committee appointed by the General Synod, who reported progress at the meeting in Dayton, Ohio, in 1855, and were continued, have merely *abridged the rubrics* by conforming them to the Formula of the General Synod, and added the so-called Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer in separate form, as recommended in their report, without attempting any improvement in the phraseology of the prayers, a very few instances excepted." Signed: S. S. Schmucker, C. P. Krauth, Sr., B. Kurtz, S. Sprecher. July 25th, 1855.

In turning to the Second and Third Articles of the Apostles' Creed, introduced after the First Form of Confession of Sin, we note the Committee used the phrases, "descended into Hell," and "The Holy Catholic Church," explaining, however, the word "Hell" by "place of departed spirits"; but when we turn to the questions asked in Baptism, the phrases "descended into the place of departed spirits," and "the holy Christian Church" occur. In the first instance the "semi-colon" is used after the word Church, but in the second the "comma."

In 1857 The General Synod met at Reading, Pa. The large Committee appointed at Dayton, Ohio, in 1855, evidently had no report to offer. But we find that "The Committee from the Lutheran Board of Publication, asking for the publication of its Hymn Book, Liturgy and Catechism, was read. The whole subject, with the accompanying documents, was referred to a special committee consisting of Rev. Messrs. A. H. Lochman, S. Sprecher, D.D., A. J. Karn, and Messrs. G. A. Barnitz, and F. Smith." This special committee made no report and so we come in 1859 to the Nineteenth Convention of the General Synod in Pittsburgh, Pa. Whilst there was nothing to report along liturgical lines, at least *constructively*, the Rev. Dr. Pohlman reporting for a Committee informed the Synod that "The Committee cannot find



that the Committee on Liturgy appointed at the Dayton session have either made report or been discharged," and so *destructively* it was "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Liturgy, appointed at Dayton, be discharged from further duty."

Let us hope that the '60's will produce better results than did the 50's, even though the din of war sounded loudly over a divided nation during this decade, and the General Synod faced a grave crisis which ultimately resulted in the organization of another general body.

The disturbed condition of our country prevented a meeting of the General Synod in 1861, but in 1862 the Twentieth Convention met at Lancaster, Pa. At the first session of the third day's proceedings, "Rev. B. M. Schmucker presented to Synod for examination a copy of the English Liturgy of the Synod of Pennsylvania, which was received and referred to a special Committee consisting of Rev. B. M. Schmucker, S. Sprecher, D.D., S. W. Harkey, D.D., T. Stork, D.D., G. B. Miller, D.D., W. H. Harrison, D.D., and Prof. P. Born." On the sixth day and at the second session, "Rev. B. M. Schmucker, from the Committee to whom the Liturgy of the Pennsylvania Synod was referred, presented a report, which was received, and after discussion, the whole subject was disposed of by the adoption of the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That a Committee of one from each District Synod here represented, be appointed, to be called the *Liturgical Committee*, to whom this report shall be referred together with the Liturgy of the Pennsylvania Synod, the General Synod's Liturgy, with the instructions to propose a Liturgy for the use of our Churches, at the next Convention of the General Synod.

"*Resolved*, That each delegation name its own member of the Committee and that the Committee thus appointed, select its chairman."

#### LITURGICAL COMMITTEE.

J. G. Morris, Maryland Synod; S. S. Schmucker, Western Pennsylvania Synod; G. A. Lintner, Hartwick; N. H.

Pohlman, New York; S. Yingling, Allegheny; M. Valentine, Eastern Pennsylvania; W. H. Harrison, Miami; S. Sprecher, Eastern Ohio; G. Crouse, Wittenberg; B. C. Suesserott, Illinois; J. A. Kunkelman, Olive Branch; G. F. Krotel, Pennsylvania Synod; S. W. Harkey, Northern Illinois; W. A. Passavant, Pittsburgh; B. Pope, English Synod of Ohio; W. G. Harter, Kentucky; D. H. Focht, Central Pennsylvania; H. Wells, Northern Indiana; Prof. H. Eggers, Southern Illinois; Prof. A. M. Geiger, Iowa; B. Kurtz, D.D., Melancthon; J. H. Barclay, Synod of New Jersey.

(To be continued.)



## ARTICLE IV.

## IS THERE NEED OF A RESTATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE?

BY LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

There lies before us a booklet fresh from the press. It bears the title, "The Need of a Restatement of Theology." Its author is the Rev. Edwin Heyl Delk, D.D., late lecturer on theology in Temple University. On its title-page it carries the imprimatur of the Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, but on the next page is inscribed this legend, "Copyright, 1917, by Edwin Heyl Delk." The meaning, no doubt, is that the Publication Society has simply printed the book for the author and at his expense.

The volume contains the substance of Dr. Delk's article, "The Minister and Modern Thought," which was published in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1912. A few of the opening portions of the original article have been omitted, and a new section on "The Person of Christ" has been added. Otherwise the essay appears almost, if not quite, as it was first printed.

In THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for April, 1913, we published a criticism of Dr. Delk's production. Apparently he has not been in the least affected by the criticisms offered, but follows the well-known policy of liberal writers the world over—he ignores them. In his "Foreword" he takes the pains to say: "I see no reason for any modification of the statements I made in my original essay." Thus, so far as his own convictions are concerned, his motto is that of the Roman Church—*semper idem*. From 1912 to the present is about five years. In these days of "modern thought" and "modification" and "restatement" it is rather remarkable that a writer would change scarcely a sentence of an essay in half a decade. We are sure that, if we were to reprint our essay of 1913, we would revise it a good deal, and try to make its statements

clearer, stronger and more convincing. But, of course, we are a "conservative and confessional theologian," and so it would be expected in us to be able to make *some* progress and improvement in the course of four or five years.

The "Foreword" also contains this assertion: "I now recognize, however, that, in presenting the facts which compel a restatement, perhaps a reconstruction, of the older theology, my critics have misunderstood the stress intended, and the extent of the modification of Christian dogmatics which would result from the acceptance of the newer point of view. In my own thinking, nothing of essential or enduring Christian dogma has been eliminated."

If the author's critics "misunderstood the stress intended," would it not have been kind and courteous so to revise his statements as to remove the ground of the misunderstanding? Nay, would it not have been in his own interest and in the interest of truth to do so? Instead of helping his critics to understand him better, he simply goes ahead and repeats his asseverations in precisely the same verbiage. For our part, as one of his critics and friends, we are anxious to understand him, and would rejoice if he could so state his views as to convince us that he stands on evangelical and Lutheran ground.

It is not our purpose to review the whole essay, nor to repeat the criticisms offered in our former article. Our chief intention is to examine the Christological chapter that has been added to the essay. But before that is done, we must deal with a few prior matters.

We begin with a statement in the "Foreword": "The rabbinical, the judicial, the metaphysical formulas in which the Christian facts were construed by St. Paul, Athanasius, Augustine, Anselm and Aquinas have passed for most moderns. Historical criticism, psychology, and a philosophy that deals with the facts of science, rather than an abstract metaphysic and logic, compel us to find other formulas for presenting the truths of Christianity."

This is, we confess, a sad and disheartening statement



right at the start. Even St. Paul's "formulas" "have passed for most moderns," and the times "compel us to find other formulas." We would not mind so much if he had not included St. Paul in the list of the obsolete theologians. His statement simply destroys St. Paul's inspiration. St. Paul's epistles are a part of the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. We cannot pause here to prove that Paul was inspired, but we must call attention, and that in the kindest spirit, to the fact that the General Synod, of which the author of this book is a minister, "receives and holds the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice" (see the General Synod's Constitution, Art. II). Therefore, according to our author, the General Synod's doctrinal formulas "have passed for most moderns," of which he professes to be one.

In the above list of outgrown theologians Athanasius is also included. His formulas, too, are "rabbinical, juridical and metaphysical," and "have passed for most moderns." There can be no doubt that the reference is to the Nicene Creed, of which Athanasius was the chief author. However, let it be understood that the Augsburg Confession endorses these very Athanasian "formulas" (see Art. I), and the General Synod "receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of our Church as founded upon the Word" (see Art. II of the General Synod's Constitution).

So much, then, for the "Foreword." In the next place, we would call attention to the fact that only two or three times in this whole book is appeal made to the Holy Scriptures. Two sayings of St. Paul are cited on page 21. In this book practically the whole appeal is made to modern thought, modern scholarship, Biblical criticism, modern science, psychology and the Christian consciousness. Man's wisdom is the sole norm, not God's wisdom—at least, not the Holy Scriptures. Again we wish to remind our readers that this view is totally different from

that of the whole Lutheran Church in America, which constantly makes the Holy Scriptures the final and deciding court of appeal. According to her constitution, the General Synod stands on this Biblical ground with all the rest of her sister synods.

The author's two opening paragraphs are new, being substituted for something else in the original paper. Hence we give them brief notice. The first sentence is, "This essay is a report, not a personal confession, of faith." Honestly we do not think any one can shirk responsibility in that way. All through the essay the writer gives the impression that he is registering his own views. If he does not accept his own "report," and still does not accept the old-line theology, what does he believe and why has he written this piece? So in spite of his disclaimer, we are compelled by the ethics involved in the case to believe that this book is "a personal confession of faith."

In his second paragraph he says: "The older conceptions of inspiration and infallibility have passed, and a truer and more reasonable conception of them has been current among students for a generation."

In one respect this is a slipshod statement. He says of "infallibility" that a "truer and more reasonable conception" is now current. This is not true, for, by his own showing in this book, the modernists do not accept *any* conception of infallibility. They do not believe in infallibility at all; not in the Bible, nor in the Church, nor in the Christian consciousness, nor anywhere else—unless, forsooth, it should be in "modern scholarship"! But, no! even that surmise is a mistake, for on page 34 our author says, "It is true that we are not now in a position to project finished systems of theology, as writers of an earlier age did," etc. So his language is not careful and precise when he makes the above declaration regarding "infallibility." Here we would gently remind the reader that the General Synod in her constitution declares that she "receives and holds the Canonical Scriptures" to be "the only *infallible* rule of faith and practice."



Note, too, what the author says about the "older conceptions of inspiration." They also "have passed." The older conception is that "every Scripture is God-breathed" (2 Tim. 3:16); that "no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:21). Of course, these citations from the Bible will not count with the liberalists, for the inspiration of the Bible is the very point at issue; but the fault we find with our author's assertion is that he rejects the older conception of Biblical inspiration by an *ipse dixit*, and yet nowhere gives us his "restatement" of the doctrine. What is *his* conception of Biblical inspiration? On pages 33, 34 he speaks of "that tyrannous literalism and false idea of inspiration," but nowhere can we find an attempt to state the modern "truer and more reasonable conception." We regret to say that this essay is far more destructive than constructive. If he should reply that in so brief an essay he could not expatiate, we would reply that he should have held back its publication until he had time to think out the positive side of the questions at issue. Moreover, it would have added no more than a page to his booklet to have given clear-cut definitions of inspiration and infallibility according to the "assured results" of modern criticism. The fact is, the liberal men do not have lucid ideas of the doctrine of Biblical inspiration. They are much more adept at saying what they do not believe than what they do believe.

From the second paragraph on to the new section on the person of Christ the book is the same as the original essay. With its contents we dealt in our article published in 1913. We wish to drop down for a moment on page 19, where evolution is defined as "God's method of creation." This is inaccurate and unscientific language. The terms "evolution" and "creation" are not synonymous; they belong to different categories entirely. Creation means bringing into existence an entity that had no existence before; evolution means the development of something that already exists. In the beginning God created the primordial matter; after that He evolved or un-

folded it according to the laws of its own constitution, adding something new by creation whenever such a work was necessary. A clear and precise thinker would not confuse evolution and creation, nor identify them, but would define evolution as God's method of unfolding the cosmos from its original simple form or state to its present complex forms or condition. We are not against evolution within its proper limits; there are evolutionary processes in the cosmos to-day, and have been ever since the Almighty created the primordial material. But evolution is only a *part* of God's *modus operandi*. Creation and miracle are the other parts. To use the word "evolution" for the entire process is to stretch it to the breaking point, and is therefore unscientific. Mere evolution—which is development by "resident" forces—is not adequate to the task of producing the universe, and bringing it to its present status of advancement, including man, with his rational, moral and spiritual enduements. If you are going to have an adequate view—and an adequate view is the only scientific view—you must use more terms to describe the whole process, namely, creation, miracle and evolution. We leave it to any clear thinker whether those three great words will not afford an adequate explanation of the cosmos as we have it to-day. Here you have assigned a sufficient cause for every effect and event; you have not violated that fundamental law of all thinking—"no effect can be greater than its cause."

We pause for a moment on page 23, where the author says: "As related to the Incarnation, the theory of evolution is in strict accord with the Christian conception. The Incarnation is that fresh and unique entrance of the divine life of the Godhead into human history which is personalized in Jesus Christ."

That is a very unscientific statement. Cannot any one, even without great scholarship, see that a "fresh and unique *entrance* of the divine life into human history" would not be evolution? Evolution is the development of something by means of *resident* forces. If you introduce something from without into the substance or the



process, it is not evolution. A "fresh and unique *entrance* of the divine life" into human history would be the introduction of something new from without—a new divine element. Strangely enough, our author describes a miracle, and then calls it evolution! We heartily agree with his definition of the Incarnation, so far as it goes, but we object to his label. This unscientific use of terms causes so much misunderstanding and confusion of thought! Page 24 contains this modest concession: "It is too soon even for a master mind to attempt the formulation of a complete Christian theology in the light of evolution." Yes, we agree to that; for when a proponent of evolution describes it as a "fresh and unique entrance" of something into something else, it is very much "too soon." Moreover, if it is "too soon even for a master mind" to produce new formulas, how can the liberalist be so cocksure that it is not too soon to discard the old formulas? Quite sure are we, at all events, that St. Paul, Athanasius, Chemnitz, Gerhard and Krauth never would have committed the egregious blunder of describing a miracle and then labeling it evolution. That exploit must be left for the advocates of "modern thought."

Further down on page 24 we find this: "One great, controlling idea it (evolution) has stimulated in all theological as well as philosophical thinking, i. e., the immanence of God in the whole continuous and endless creative process." Notice the unscientific use of the word "creative" again. "It has corrected that conception of God which separates Him from an active entrance into all life. It has broken down a false dualism—the barrier between the divine and the human."

Here we must charge modern evolutionism and thinking with trying to capture and claim honors that do not belong to them. Do these modernists really think that they have discovered the great doctrine of the divine immanence? When was there a time when orthodox Christian theologians did not teach it and insist upon it? The Bible teaches it everywhere. That God is omnipresent is inculcated in the 139th Psalm; yes, and long before that

melodious poem was written. Paul said, "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." Christ said, "My Father in you, and ye in Me, and I in you." We have read many Lutheran theologies of the orthodox type, but we do not know of one that did not treat the doctrine of the divine immanence or omnipresence among the other *theologici loci*. They even teach that God is present with the wicked, and sustains their lives even while they are sinning, though He does not concur ethically in their wrong doing, but spares them in order to give them a chance to repent. (See Jacobs' "A Summary of the Christian Faith," p. 73, q. 21; Valentine's "Christian Theology," Vol. I, pages 149, 229, 230). In the days of Deism in England, what did the Christian apologists do but defend and uphold the immanence of God, as well as His transcendence? Every one of them, from Bishop Horne to William Paley, did this. No; the doctrine and experience of the divine immanence is not a recent discovery, either of science or of the "new" theology. However, the pantheistic heresy of the divine immanence, which denies the divine transcendence and personality and identifies God and the universe—that all evangelical theologians now reject, and always have.

The section on Christology must now claim our attention. This is the new chapter of the essay. With regret we have to say that, for the most part, the author's treatment of the person of Christ and His atonement is not Biblical, nor Lutheran, nor well reasoned, nor adequate. The opening sentences of this division are commonplace, and so we need not tarry. Soon, however, he shows his radical "modernism." Let him speak for himself: "The metaphysical and docetic atmosphere in which most of the earlier treatises were projected has been superseded by the historical, human approach in the study of our Lord's personality. Not that the supernatural factors, as declared in the New Testament, are ignored or denied, but that the earthly, human side of Jesus' nature and career has become the starting-point for the study of His person. Albert Schweitzer, in 'The Quest for the Historical



Jesus,' has given us the classic study of this phase of the person of Christ."

The reflection on "most of the earlier treatises" as "metaphysical and docetic" is untrue and unjust. That there were docetists—those who denied the reality of Christ's human nature—in those days is true enough, but they were always condemned as heretics by the orthodox party. Dr. Delk's sweeping assertion would seem to include even the framers of the Nicene Creed, which asserted the true manhood of Christ; and so did the Athanasian Creed; so the Augsburg Confession; and we do not know of a single Lutheran theologian who has not rejected docetism, and taught that Christ is "very man of very man." But our author holds that "the human side of Christ has now become the starting-point in the study of His person." That is just the danger of this radical "modernism"; it puts so much emphasis on the human side that, if it does not deny, it at least neglects, the divine side. It even tries to account for the person of Christ by evolution. We have read Albert Schweitzer's book, "The Mystery of the Kingdom of God," which is a later work than the one that Dr. Delk praises so highly, and we are bound to say that he makes Christ so decidedly human, with His mistaken and even fanatical notions of eschatology and apocalypse, that we cannot see where His divine nature could have a place. To attribute human frailty and error to Christ is certainly to destroy His value as the divine-human Saviour of the world; the One in whom we can repose unfaltering trust for our eternal salvation.

At all events, to make Christ's human nature the starting-point is not the Biblical way, which emphasizes both the divine and the human elements in His person proportionately and correlates them properly, and thus forms the basis for our evangelical creeds and systems of theology. Suppose we just scrutinize the Biblical method for a little while. In Matt. 1:18-23 we have the narrative of the interview of the angel of the annunciation with Joseph, in which Joseph was told that Mary, his betrothed

wife, was with child by the Holy Ghost. Then the angel said: "And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call His name Jesus; for it is He that shall save His people from their sins." And the name Jesus, when traced back through the Hebrew, means Jehovah-Saviour. Here both the divine and human elements are indicated. A little later the angel said, "And His name shall be called Immanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us." Here the Deity of Christ is clearly indicated. The Bible does not make the human nature "the starting-point." Indeed, it starts with both natures in conjunction, with Christ's whole theanthropic person, the well-balanced Book it is. We confess to a decided preference for the Biblical way of putting things. It does not put them one-sidedly. In St. Luke's account of the angel Gabriel's visit to the Virgin Mary, we find the same beautiful co-ordination of the divine and human elements in Christ's person. And all through the thrilling narratives of the evangelists both natures proceed together in the unity of the person. Now this nature, now that, comes most to the fore; but Christ is always the one person, the one "I," the one "He." For the most part, Jesus lived a natural human life, but here and there His divinity flashed out in a wonderful way, just as should have been the case if He was the incarnate Son of God. From the full Biblical representation our evangelical theologians have drawn and formulated their Christological doctrine.

Again we quote from our author: "But the abiding fact of the indwelling of the divine nature in Jesus does receive a different interpretation from that presented in the Chalcedonian Creed, or that of the speculative *communicatio idiomatum*."

It certainly is poor theology to speak of "the indwelling of the divine nature in Jesus"; at least, it is an ambiguous mode of expression. It sounds as if the author believed that Jesus was merely a human being in whom the divine nature dwelt. If that is what the author meant, he is wrong theologically, and his teaching is absurd and puerile. For if Jesus was merely a human per-



son in whom the divine nature dwelt, then Jesus was one person and the divine nature another, and that would make Him a being composed of two persons; which would be an absurdity. No; the divine nature was a constituent element of Christ; indeed, it constituted the *ego* of Him. The divine Logos assumed human nature, not a human person. If the divine Logos, who was a person from eternity, had taken a human person into His Godhead, the result would have been a being with two *egos*; which, as we have said, would have been an absurdity, not to say a monstrosity. It would have made the unity of Christ's self-consciousness impossible. Then He would have had to say "We," and could not have said "I." On the other hand, if the divine nature merely dwelt in Jesus as a human person, then there was only a *mystical* union between Him and the Logos; there was no hypostatic union, no divine incarnation. The proper Deity of Christ would thus be nullified. If He would differ from the Christian believer, who is also mystically united with God, it would be only in degree. He would not be unique; He would not be the God-man; He would not be the Redeemer of the world and the Lord of creation.

Observe that our brother cannot away with the Christology of the Chalcedonian Creed. This we regret exceedingly. The great creed in question makes one of the clearest, fullest, profoundest and most discriminating statements of the person of Christ that was ever formulated. It sets forth precisely the same doctrine that is found in the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed and the Augsburg Confession. We quote from the creed of Chalcedon:

"We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in Manhood; truly God and truly Man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father, according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us, according to the Manhood; in all things, except sin, like unto us; begotten before all ages of the Father, accord-

ing to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, 'inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably'; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in One Person and One Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only begotten God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has taught, and the Creed of the Fathers has handed down to us."

Marvellous! sublime! discriminating! Biblical! true! There we have the whole doctrine of the adorable person of our heavenly Lord and Saviour. We can accept it with all our heart. Note the unity of the person, hence oneness of self-consciousness; veritable Godhood ("consubstantial with the Father"); true Manhood ("in all things, except sin, like unto us"); the two natures in holy and most intimate union and communion, and yet without consubstantiation ("unconfused"); without transubstantiation ("unchanged"); without separation in respect to place ("indivisible"); without separation in respect to duration ("inseparable"). All the *loci* are beautifully correlated, and all apparent contradictions harmonized. Do we really need a restatement of the doctrine to put it in accord with the so-called "modern thought"? If we do, let us have greater clearness, not greater confusion and ambiguity. We challenge the whole modernist school to make a restatement of Christology that will excel, or even equal, the statement of the old Chalcedonian Symbol. In comparison, Dr. Delk's "restatement," made either by himself or by the authors he quotes, is hazy, nebulous; above all, partial and one-sided. And why? Because he and his school have not gone to the "pure fountains of Israel," the inspired Word of God, but to their own rationalistic thinking.



Our author also criticises the Lutheran doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*, or the communication of properties in the person of Christ. He calls it "speculative." But it is drawn from the Holy Scriptures, was taught by Luther, even if he did not use the term, and is advocated and defended in the Formula of Concord and by all our orthodox Lutheran theologians from Chemnitz and Gerhard to Krauth, Jacobs, Valentine, Graebner and Blomgren. This doctrine has been developed in the Lutheran Church in opposition to the Nestorian heresy, which so separated the divine and human natures as practically to divide the person of Christ. The dogma is a marvellous correlation of the whole Scriptural teaching on the person and natures of our Redeemer. Let us see if it is not so. There are three *genera* of the *communicatio idiomatum*. When Christ said, "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins," He used one form of the *Genus Idiomaticum*; that is, He predicated a divine attribute of the human concrete (the person viewed from the human side). When He said, "Father, glorify thou me with thine own glory, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," He employed the *Genus Majestaticum*; which means that the divine properties were communicated to the human nature. For other conspicuous examples of the same *Genus* see Matt. 28:18; 28:20; Col. 2:9. When Paul declared that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3), he made use of the *Genus Apotelesmaticum*, meaning that both the divine and human natures shared in the death of Christ; the human nature dying, and the divine nature sympathizing with it in its suffering, supporting it through the ordeal, and giving infinite value and efficacy to the sacrifice. Call it "speculation," if you will, it is all taught clearly in God's Word.

Some of our liberal friends do not believe in these "fine-spun distinctions," as they call them. That is the trouble with the school; they seem to want to blur all distinctions. Is it because they do not have the mental acumen to see distinctions where there are differences, or have

they in heart gone over to monistic pantheism, and yet have not the courage to say so? We should like to know what their philosophy is—dualism or monism. Let us remember the good old adage: *Bene docet qui bene distinguit.*

Next our polemist dissents from the orthodox doctrine of the “two natures” in Christ, which, he asserts, “in its traditional form, imparts into the life of Christ an incredible and thorough-going dualism. In place of that perfect unity which is felt in every impression of Him, the whole is bisected by the fissure of distinction. No longer one, He is divided against himself.”

Here he is wrong again. The distinction of natures taught by evangelical theology creates no schism in the person of Christ. “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.” It was the very purpose of the incarnation to bring the two natures into the most intimate and harmonious union and relation, so that, when our humanity is united by regeneration and faith with Christ, it is truly, lovingly united with divinity again. The moral and spiritual gulf between God and man that was caused by sin has been bridged by the incarnation of the divine Son of God. Originally God and man were in loving spiritual communion; then sin came and broke that fellowship; but the Logos came and restored it in and through His incarnation and soteriological work. It certainly is a beautiful, rational and organic method. There is nothing artificial and mechanical about it.

Nor is it true that this conception introduces “into the life of Christ an incredible and thorough-going dualism.” There is no “bisecting,” no “fissure.” Just as before sin came into the world there was no schism between man’s body and soul, so there is no antagonism between the divine and human natures in the person of Christ. True dualism there is, just as there is dualism in man, who is composed of body and mind, but no opposition, no antinomy. It is a curious thing that some would-be modern thinkers cannot see that two different entities can be joined in a most beautiful harmony in a universe that God has made. If He could make two different substances,



mind and matter, He certainly could so constitute them that they would blend into a perfect harmony, and that, too, without consubstantiation. So God could blend into a perfect union divinity and humanity in the one person of Christ without a consubstantiation of them. He who cannot believe that would better announce himself frankly as a pantheist.

Again Dr. Delk: "The self-consciousness of Jesus, as depicted by the evangelists, we may call divine or human as we please; to express the whole truth, we must call it both at once. But it is single consciousness after all; it moves always as a spiritual unity, and separatist or divisive theories do a grave disservice, not merely to clear thinking, but to religious truth and power. It hypostatizes falsely two *aspects* of a single concrete life," and so on through a sentence that vapors off into obscurity.

We deny point-blank that the last sentence quoted above states the truth. The Lutheran doctrine of the two natures in Christ does *not* "hypostatize" them. If this writer uses the term "hypostatize" accurately, he means that the traditional view *personalizes* each nature in Christ, thus making Him two persons. In the name of reason, why should any one so distort history? Orthodox theology, from the days of the council of Nice to the present time, has always opposed the Nestorian doctrine of separating the two natures of Christ into two persons. On the contrary, it has always insisted on the unity of the person in the two natures. Read all the ecumenical creeds and all the Lutheran Symbols, and see what the facts are. This is a marvellous thing—that a would-be modern thinker, who feels it his duty to restate Christian doctrine to bring it up to date, should accuse traditional theology of teaching the very heresy that it has always rejected with heart and soul.

As to the statement that the consciousness of Christ "is a single consciousness after all; it moves always as a spiritual unity," this is true, but it is only a part of the truth, and therefore is lacking in discrimination. Orthodox theology has always maintained that Christ's person

is one; one *ego*, not two; and therefore that His consciousness is a single consciousness. This is the very basis of what is known in Lutheran theology as the "unity of the person." However, the unity of the person—in other words, the singleness of the consciousness—is not in the least in conflict with the duality of the natures, and only superficial thinking would lead one so to conclude. The two natures in Christ are so intimately and lovingly joined in the hypostatic union that the one person is perfectly conscious of the fact of this union, and carries this consciousness harmoniously through both natures. If this statement seems abstruse, let us illustrate. Man is a dual being, made up of mind and body; but he is only one person; he has not a dual consciousness, but a single one; yet he is vividly conscious of the duality of his being. Does he not clearly distinguish between the *psuche* and the *soma*? For instance, when he eats, he says, "I taste this food." But he means that he tastes it with his body. When he uses his mind, he says, "I think." But he means that he thinks with his mind. He uses the same "I" in each case, the same undivided *ego*, and yet he distinguishes between the two natures of which he is composed. It would be strange if, when the divine Logos took human nature into His Godhead, He could not retain the unity of His consciousness, and yet distinguish between His divine and human natures and the peculiar functioning of each. No; our friend is wrong, not to say superficial, when he thinks that unity of consciousness cannot subsist with two natures.

When he says, "The self-consciousness of Jesus. . . . we may call either divine or human as we please," he is correct. That is precisely what is meant in Lutheran theology by the *Genus Idiomaticum*—that you may ascribe either divine or human *idiomata* to the concrete of the person regarded from either nature; that is, you may say: "The Son of Man (the human concrete) is almighty (a divine attribute), or the Son of Man died on the cross (a human attribute)." Or you may say: "The Son of God (the divine concrete) is almighty, or He died on the cross." Also: "Christ



(the concrete of both natures) is almighty, or died on the cross." Then our author correctly says: "To express the whole truth, we must call it both at once." Precisely; that is just what Lutheran theology means by the "Apothelematic Genus," namely, that the person performs every mediatorial act through both natures, the divine and the human, each functioning according to its own inherent constitution. To illustrate, while the person Christ died only according to his human nature, His divine nature suffered and sympathized with it, sustained it in the ordeal, and imparted infinite value to the expiatory sacrifice. Again, when our Lord multiplied the loaves and fishes, He, the person, performed the miracle by virtue of His divine nature; yet His human nature shared in the act in a very vital way. Just so, when a man (the human person) performs a physical or a mental act, we say, He (the *ego*, the person) did the act, but each nature performed its appropriate function in the act. Could anything be clearer, and at the same time more profoundly true and rational?

However, our author introduces confusion and error into his thesis when he represents the two natures in Christ as only "two *aspects* of a single concrete life." That means that the two natures are merged into one nature, which is consubstantiation; and surely, surely he cannot believe that there was a consubstantiation of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ. Why, that was the old Eutychian and Monophysite heresy of the first three centuries of the Christian era, which was condemned by all the orthodox councils of those times.

Next, we must enter the field of ontology, for our essayist leads us into these difficult and metaphysical spheres. On page 39 he quarrels with the idea of two natures "inseparately joined together" in a person. "To put it frankly," he says, "when we abstract personality . . . . . what we vaguely call 'human nature' is not human nature in the least. There is no such thing as an impersonal human nature. In earlier theology human nature *is* taken as real apart from personality—the manhood is anhypostatic." This Lutheran doctrine our protagonist

rejects, and he calls on Seeburg and Loofs to abet his views.

We see no way but to think this matter through, difficult as it is. First, we think it a vague and indeterminate kind of philosophizing. If a "restatement" of doctrine means to substitute vagueness for the definite and comparatively simple statements of orthodox theology, we do not see that anything is to be gained. But, next, let us enter in *medias res*. Take the proposition: Apart from personality there is no such thing as human nature. That is to confuse quality with substance, *phenomenon* with *noumenon*. Personality is a quality, not an entity, not a substance. Is it not clear that without substance, you could not have quality; without the *noumena* you could not have the *phenomena*? True, we do not know what substance is, but we do know intuitively that, if the world is not a mere phantasm and delusion, there must be something there, the thing in itself, the *ontos*, or there never could be the attributes of weight, force, light, life, consciousness, egoism or personality. If there were no mental substance, there would be nothing to carry on thought processes. An absolute blank could not think; a piece of nothing could not feel or will. Figure it as you will, there must be "the thing in itself." One of the best definitions of mind that we have ever seen was made by a recent scholar and philosopher: "Mind is self-conscious substance."

Now, following the same kind of reasoning, we contend that there must be the *substance* of human nature, or there never could be human egoity. And God must have created the substance which He endowed with personality and all its other qualities. Therefore in the seminal depth of every human being there must lie the substance of human beings yet unborn, and therefore still impersonal, only awaiting the conditions of fertilization and procreation to be evolved into personal beings. There can be no "I" until conception (perhaps not until birth) has taken place. Only when the proper conjunction of the man and the woman occurs, is a new human *ego* born,



but it is born from the latent, seminal, and as yet impersonal substance of human nature carried down through the generations from the first human pair. There must be such a perduring human substance, or the race could not be perpetuated.

Apply this reasoning to the person of our Lord. The divine Logos, a person from eternity, entered the seminal depth of the Virgin Mary, and took from her the substance of human nature, both psychical and somatic, purified it from all sin and corruption, and assumed it into His Godhood in that mysterious act which we reverently call the incarnation. The Logos was a person, and therefore had no need to add another person to Himself. He did not first produce a human person in the Virgin, and then unite Himself with it; but in the very act of assumption He took only human nature into His Deity. Yes, the human nature was "anhypostatic" before the incarnation, but in the *unitio* it became "enhypostatic," receiving its personality from the divine Son of God. Why, it *must* have been so. Suppose for a moment that the Holy Ghost would have brought forth a human person, and then would have united it with the personal Logos, there would have been produced a being who was two persons; which would be a preposterous conception. It is not theologically correct, therefore, to say that the divine Logos assumed *a* human body and *a* human soul, for then He would have taken a human person into His Godhead. We should say, He assumed human nature in both parts, psychical and somatic.

Sometimes the objection has been made that, if the Logos assumed only human nature and not a human person, He could not be truly human, could not be "very man of very man," and so could not be our real human friend and sympathizer, after all. However, a little lucid thinking will clear away the difficulty, and prove that the Bible way is the right one. Personality is not an attribute that is peculiar to human beings. God is a person; angels are persons. A person is any kind of a being that has self-consciousness and can say "I." Thus egoity is



not something distinctive in human nature; it is the character and composition of human nature itself that is *sui generis*. It differs *qualitatively* from angelic nature and from the divine nature. That is the very reason why we call it *human*. Therefore, when the personal Logos assumed human nature, He became truly human, and hence can enter to the uttermost into the fellowship of all our joys and sorrows. It is the fact that the divine Son of God took our human nature into His very Deity that makes His companionship and sympathy so real and precious to us. The Bible way is always the right way, the profound way, the organic way.

It would not be becoming to ask the indulgent editors for more space. Therefore we shall not be able to discuss the work of Christ (Soteriology), which our author makes the mistake of treating under the head of "the person of Christ." We had intended to show the un-Biblical and un-Lutheran position taken by him on the doctrine of the atonement; also the weakness of his reasoning. But we are ashamed to ask for more space. Still, we must add, when this critic and opponent of evangelical and Lutheran theology holds that "the redemption of the individual" is based "upon our inner, spiritual, religious attitude of penitence and faith toward God as revealed in the suffering, wooing love of Jesus Christ," we can do no less than express our extreme sorrow and shame that a minister who bears the Lutheran name should propose such a heretical doctrine. For the rest, we would refer the reader to our article on "The Lutheran View of the Atonement," which was published in THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for April, 1916. In conclusion, we would say, to a "restatement" *per se* of Christian doctrine we do not object, providing it is a clear and true explication and development; but to a "restatement" like that of this book, which obscures and nullifies our fundamental doctrines, we do enter our most earnest protest; and we hope that others who stand for evangelical principles will also speak out.

*Hamma Divinity School,  
Springfield, Ohio.*



## ARTICLE V.

## THE MESSAGE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH TO AMERICA.\*

BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

Our subject may be approached from two main points of view. The message of the Lutheran Church to America consists, I say, of two parts. The first part of our message grows out of the cosmopolitan character of the American people on the one hand and the evangelical character of the Lutheran faith on the other hand. The second part of our message grows out of the outstanding characteristics of American religious life on the one hand and the essential elements of Lutheran piety on the other hand. The one is a message from the catholicity of Lutheran doctrine; the other is a message from the vitality of Lutheran piety and Lutheran religious life.

First, then, the cosmopolitan American nation and the evangelical Lutheran faith.

It needs no argument, of course, to prove that America is a cosmopolitan nation. In a hundred ways each day it comes home to you that the American nationality is a composite product. I content myself, therefore, with affirming the fact, and I pass on. Only this must be observed in passing: the American nation is not a conglomerate heterogeniety; the American nation is not a mosaic of nationalities. A stranger coming to our country, if he should visit only our largest cities, might get the false impression that America consists of a patchwork of little Chinas, and little Italies, and little Germanies, and little Judeas, and so forth. If that were true, the message of the Lutheran Church to this country would be very different from what it actually is. Our message to Italy whether real Italy or little Italy, would be different from our message to America. And so on.

\* An address delivered at the opening of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, September 19, 1917.

No, our nation is not a mosaic of European nationalities. The typical American is an entirely new product and a very different thing from what you could find in Europe. Our nationality is the product of what William T. Stead called "Creation by Amalgamation." And that is important for our subject. The peculiarity of American institutions is the result of a long process of cultural reaction between the European and the western frontier. The forces dominating American character to-day are the outgrowth of a gradual development from the simplicity of primitive industrial society to the complexity of modern manufacturing civilization with its capitalistic spirit and its high finance. The European has conquered the wilderness but during the process the wilderness has reacted upon the European and made him over into a new character with new ideas and new ideals. With steady step the western frontier, that meeting-point between civilization and savagery, has been pushed across the American expanse and a few years ago was pushed into the Pacific Ocean. But this frontier has been the crucible in which the different European nationalities have been moulded into an entirely new product known as the American. The American nation is not a mixture of European nations; it is a new nation. And this is a fact of no small consequence in determining the message of the Lutheran Church to America.

For it has often been observed, of course, that there is a relation between the nationality of a people and the religious faith of that nation. This is a reciprocal relationship. That is to say, the nationality of a people influences and modifies the religion of that people, and conversely, the religion of a people influences and modifies the nationality of that people. In the light of that fact now I raise the question, What is the message of the Lutheran faith to the American people?

It is sometimes asserted that because of the national origins of the Lutheran Church and because of the distinctive psychology and temperament of her adherents, the influence of our faith in this wide-stretching country will always be limited and our message to this cosmopoli-



tan people will never be widely read. From without we are charged with being an alien religion, an immigration Church, an un-American faith. From within the complaint is sometimes made that the thin American soul is too shallow soil on which to produce a luxurious growth of genuine Lutheranism. A few months ago a certain Lutheran pastor lately arrived in our country from his native land in northern Europe publicly asserted that the Lutheran faith is really too deep for the practical superficial American mind to hold it. Now this simply expresses more or less precisely a thought that is held in various forms and in various quarters. And it has seriously interfered in times past with an adequate expression of our message to this country of which we are a part.

Well now, let us see: *is* the message of the Lutheran Church to America *limited* by virtue of any inherent qualities of our faith; is her influence on this nation circumscribed because of any essential characteristic of our Church?

There was a time, as you probably know, when many good people thought that Lutheranism was to be limited to a particular language or a particular nation. Even in our own country, with its men of broad vision and deep insight, that view was held. We know now that that was a mistake. After several generations of direful discussion of the question it is clear on all sides now that God's Word and Luther's teaching can be carried into many languages and can be translated into the thought and feeling of many nations.

True, the cradle of our faith was in Germany. But our faith has long since outgrown its cradle and has passed the period of its infancy. It is quite capable to-day of standing upon its own feet and indeed for some time now it has been walking quite nimbly up and down among the races of mankind. It can thrive in the atmosphere of any language and can flourish in the climate of any nationality.

It is true that the Lutheran Church, in the distribution of her membership among the nations of the earth, still

shows the effects of her historical origin. It is true that most Germans are Lutherans. The religion of Luther counts about forty millions out of a total population of about sixty-eight millions in the German Empire. And the Germans of other lands are predominantly Lutheran. *But* the German nation is not married to Lutheranism. For she admits Roman Catholicism to her bed and board and bank account with a liberality that makes the Pope's Church a close rival with Luther's in the graces of the German nation as a whole. And other Churches besides the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic are well represented among those who speak the German language. To be a German, therefore, is not necessarily to be a Lutheran.

And on the other hand, to be a Lutheran does not necessarily mean that one must be a German. It is true, most Lutherans *are* Germans. More than half of the Lutherans in the world are found in Germany, and millions of Lutherans in other lands are Germans of the dispersion. *But*, again the figures *are* misleading. Lutheranism is not wedded to the national genius of the Germans. The Lutheran fold does not limit its sheep to any particular stripe of nationality. There are whole nations outside of Germany where Lutheranism flourishes even more luxuriantly than in the land of Luther himself. In Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, the Lutheran Church reigns not only supreme but almost unanimously. And even in America I have heard that there are some very good Lutherans,—Lutherans who are so happy in their faith and so proud of their Church that they are willing to gather by the hundreds of thousands this year to celebrate the historical origin of their faith.

Again, it is true, Martin Luther, that noble man of God from whom our faith takes its name,—Martin Luther was a German of the Germans, the greatest and most German of them all, and in many respects a faithful embodiment of the spirit of his nation in that age. But Martin Luther was first of all a man and after that a German. And that great experience of his which gave birth to the great Reformation he realized as a member



of the human race and not as the citizen of any particular nation. Luther and his fellow Reformers never did claim to have invented a new religion. Nor did they even claim to have originated a new interpretation of Christianity. They only claimed to have rediscovered the original Gospel and to have introduced it into their own times. They would have been the first to deny that the religious movement of their day was the original product of their own German hearts and minds, and Luther himself would have been the last to consent that this revival of primitive Christianity, this restoration of the Pauline faith, should be known by his own or by any other distinctively personal or national denomination.

Now that brings us to the very gist of the whole matter. The Reformation faith is a faith that makes a universal appeal because the Reformation itself which gave birth to that faith dealt not with incidentals and particulars but primarily with fundamentals and elementals. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was not the work of a man nor was it the work of a nation. It was more than that. It was the working out of certain great principles. The times were ripe for the birth of those principles. But they had first to be experienced in the profound soul of some forceful personality before they could become effective in history. The chosen instrument of that mission was Martin Luther. He felt deeply himself and he wrought upon the very sources of human feelings in others. And so it was that the Reformation as it actually took place was the outward expression of the inner experience of this one man. There in the rugged soul of the Augustinian monk was fought out the battle between the two eras.

Ah! how your writers of fiction love to depict great mental crises in the lives of their imaginary heroes and heroines. And how these stories do charm us! Victor Hugo, in that greatest romance of all literature, describes with great vividness what he calls "A Tempest in a Brain," and lays bare the mental processes of his hero before the gaze of his fascinated reader. And since the days of Victor Hugo lesser literary lights have resorted

to the same device and have tried to fix the reader's attention upon the emotional life, the psychological passes, the silent reasonings, of their heroes. But I tell you, in this matter history is stranger than fiction. Luther in the birth-throes of the Reformation passed through a veritable tempest in the heart, a genuine crisis of the soul that surpassed anything that fiction can conjure up. And the result of that tremendous religious crisis, that terrific tempest in the soul of a sincere and thoroughgoing man,—the result of that experience was the unshakeable conviction within the heart and mind of Martin Luther that the just shall live by faith in Christ and alone by faith in Christ. That conviction, based on experience, became the very soul of the Reformation even as the Word of God afterwards became its body.

Now the point about that whole matter that concerns us to-day is this: when Martin Luther in the inmost experience of his deep pious soul gave birth to the material principle of the Reformation it was not the German in him, it was the human in him that there received expression. He had gone down in his devout struggle after a sense of forgiveness, a sense of peace with God,— he had gone down to those profound depths where incidentals have been lost, where particulars have been forgotten, and where one is on a level with the very elements of human nature. His prophetic genius touched the very heart-strings of human interest and human passion and struck a theme of universal appeal. His serious sensitiveness, his keen responsiveness to the divine impulse, led him to strike such a profound chord in the hearts of his fellows that it not only delighted his contemporaries and fascinated the people of his own nation but taken up by them has been resounding almost without intermission during four centuries past.

It was for the world he wrought, for the human race he travailed in his soul, for man as man he struggled, for humankind he agonized. In that experience of his he rose far above his circumstances of time and place. He laid hold on eternity. His spirit was drenched in the thoughts of eternity and his pen dripped with supernal



truth. That is why his religion has manifested power to take captive all ages and all races.

This, I claim, is a unique quality in Lutheranism. Luther in his Reformation experience sounded the very depths of human nature. As a consequence, the faith which bears his name makes a direct appeal to the very heart and soul of man, in a way that is without a parallel in any other form of Christianity.

You will understand what I mean when I explain there have been three main types of Christianity in the course of Christian history.

First, there is the Greek type of Christianity. And in the Greek conception of salvation the emphasis is placed upon the great contrast between death and life. Separation from God is death; union with God is life. Now this is a style of thought that makes a special appeal to Greek and Slav mind, and the consequence is, Russia and the Balkan States, including Greece, have been the special homes, almost the exclusive homes, of the Greek Orthodox Church to this day.

Second, there is the Latin type of Christianity. And in the Latin conception of redemption the emphasis is placed upon the contrast between sin and righteousness. Something must be *done* to purge a man of sin and to make him actually righteous. This is a style of thought that makes a special appeal to the Latin mind of the Romance peoples, and the consequence is, the countries of southern Europe have been the homes of the Roman Catholic Church to this day.

Third, there is the Teutonic, the Anglo-Saxon, the Protestant type of Christianity. This takes its beginning in the German Reformation of the sixteenth century. Here there is no effort to establish a new interpretation of Christianity, no effort to form a new type of Christian thought, but an effort simply and solely to go back beyond the Roman forms, back beyond the Greek speculations, back to the original essence of Christianity itself, back to Christ. Here the idea of redemption gathers about the Person of Christ. The hope of man's salvation rests solely upon the gracious will of God as revealed

in Christ, and not upon anything that man himself can do or think. With unswerving consistency Luther hammered to pieces the Roman conception of merit and with inexorable logic he pointed out that all human righteousness is incomplete. At every turn of the road he pointed men to the gracious will of God, of God who is greater than our heart because He *forgives* us our sins through the merit of Jesus Christ.

Now if we had time to make a close analysis of these three types we should find that Luther's understanding of the process of redemption, unlike the Greek and the Latin understandings, issues from the very heart of the Gospel and goes to the very heart of human nature. Yes, we have a religion that is not based upon a creed, nor upon a code, but upon a Person. In Lutheranism all the emphasis is placed upon the Person of Christ who is the object of our worship. In Lutheranism also we have the most complete regard for the personality of the worshipper, the most thorough appreciation of man as man. Now it is this very emphasis upon the principle of personality, the infinite value of the human soul, that lies at the basis of the universal character of Christianity itself. Hence, Lutheranism, although it was born on the genial soil of the deep German soul, nevertheless seems to reach the very heart of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the very core of the theology of the Apostle Paul, and this was the only hope and claim of its founders. And for this very reason Lutheranism can never be the exclusive possession of any particular race or nation, but can be applied wherever there are human souls capable of worshipping God.

Well, if this be true, that the Reformation faith can be applied wherever there are human souls capable of worshipping God, what shall we say of its application to this country of ours which we love?

We Americans are a religious people,—comparatively speaking—and our national life and our national institutions have been profoundly influenced by religion. But if we examine the situation closely we are forced to conclude that the Lutheran faith with its two and a half million communicants and its five or six million adherents



in this country has not exerted an influence proportional to the numbers and the resources which it registers in this land. Now I am firmly convinced that the fault of this is not to be found in Lutheranism as a faith but in Lutherans as a class. Surely there is nothing in the nature of the Lutheran faith that conflicts with the national genius of Americans! I say, Lutheranism is just as well adapted to the Anglo-Saxon mind of Americans as any other faith is. Lutheranism is not too narrow for Americans: it is not a strait-jacket. Nor is it too broad for the Anglo-Saxon. I don't agree for a moment with the Swedish pastor who said that "the Lutheran faith is really too big for the practical superficial American mind to hold it." I don't believe a word of it. I believe that the Lutheran faith is so simple in its essence and so human in its appeal and in its implications, that *even* an American can be an elementary Lutheran at least.

If I had to believe that the American nation, this product of creation by amalgamation,—if I had to believe that the settling of the American continent with white men from the various countries of Europe had produced a nation that is essentially incapable of apprehending the evangelical Lutheran faith,—then I might indeed be compelled to believe, as some one has suggested, that the discovery of America was a mistake, that history went wrong when Columbus crossed the ocean, and that the opening of this western hemisphere as the abode of civilized man was nothing less than a calamity to civilization. But I don't believe either end of the proposition. I believe so firmly in the humanity of the typical American and in the divinity of the Christian Gospel that I am convinced they belong together. And it is the evangelical character of our faith that makes it especially applicable to American life. For ours is not a Swedish Lutheran Church, nor a German Lutheran Church, nor an English Lutheran Church, nor even an American Lutheran Church, but ours is the *Evangelical* Lutheran Church, the Gospel Lutheran Church. Therein lies the universal appeal of our faith.

What shall we say then of the message of the Lutheran Church to America? The universal appeal of the Lutheran faith, which I have tried to indicate to you, forces us to the conclusion that the Lutheran Church, so far from being seriously limited in her influence upon this nation, so far from being circumscribed and narrowed in her message to America, makes a special appeal to the American and has a distinctive message and mission to this country.

We are celebrating this year the 400th anniversary of the Reformation. Well, that was a magnificent drama of providence that was being enacted four centuries ago. And the event that marked the year 1517 as the beginning of the Reformation and the year 1917 as the quadricentennial year was the very climax of a drama the most sublime that has ever appeared upon the stage of history. That was a drama that challenges the admiration of the historian, compels the faith of the Christian, and inspires the abiding gratitude of the entire Protestant world. Many and varied were the changes that were coming over the mind and heart of man in those days as he expanded his knowledge of the face of the earth, as he multiplied his mastery of the forces of nature, and as he deepened his insight into the secret springs of religion. An amazing concert of movements it was that brought forth that far-reaching event which we celebrate this year. An amazing concert of movements with a marvelous unity of purpose was bringing forth the most momentous change that has ever taken place in all the history of Christianity. And in that grand symphony of movements Luther's revolt was *one* motive and the discovery of this western hemisphere was another motive in the *same* symphony. For when Martin Luther, son of Hans Luther, down in the heart of Germany, was but an enterprising lad approaching his ninth birthday, Christopher Columbus was crossing the ocean and chancing upon that happy accident which we call the discovery of America. Now do you stop to consider, when you think of the mission of our faith on this continent and the message of our Church to this country, do you stop to consider the significance



of the fact that at the very time that God was using Martin Luther and others to purge the Church of its crying abuses and to turn Christianity back to its original purity of faith, the same God was also using Christopher Columbus and others to spread the boundaries of the habitable earth and thus open up a continent where this new faith would some day number its adherents by the millions? Or do you refuse to see the hand of God in this conjunction of events? Are not the two facts related, the discovery of America and the Lutheran Reformation? They most certainly are related, not only in time, but also in purpose, not only in history but also in destiny. For I verily believe that the Lutheran faith whose origin we celebrate this year makes a special appeal to the heart and soul of the American and therefore has a distinctive mission to perform on this continent, both because of the ethnology of the American nation and because of the theology of the Lutheran faith.

This, then, I regard as the first and the more general aspect of our message to this country. The evangelical character of the Lutheran faith with its emphasis upon personality has a special adaptability to a democratic republic where a man is valued as a man and to a cosmopolitan nation which has created a unity of nationality out of a variety of European nations.

Now, in the second place and more specifically, let us inquire, What is the message of the Lutheran Church to America in view of the outstanding characteristics of American religious life?

Here be it observed, first of all in a negative way, that our message does not grow out of our numbers or our growth in times past or our present rate of increase. The facts in this particular are beautiful enough. We began in 1638 with 50 souls. One hundred years later, in 1738, we had 5000 members. After another hundred years, in 1838, we had 65,000 members. In the next ten years we more than doubled our numbers, so that by 1848 we had 135,000. Ten years later, in 1858, we had 200,000. After another decade, at the close of the Civil War, we had 350,000. Still another ten years passed and by the

Centennial Year we had 650,000 Lutherans in this country. Thirty years ago we numbered just one million members. Twenty years ago it was one million and a half. Ten years ago we had over a million and three-quarters. Five years ago we numbered two million, two hundred thousand; two years ago, over two millions and a quarter. Last year nearly two millions and a half. And this year doubtless over two millions and a half. Yes, the figures and statistics are beautiful enough. A faith that has added a million and a half members in thirty years and is now increasing at the rate of more than a million every ten years,—a Church that has had for many years the highest ratio of progress among all the large denominations in this country,—such a faith might be thought to have a fine lesson in figures to place before the country.

But there are other factors to consider besides these bald statistics. And after all, what do figures amount to? I have seen so many things “proved” by statistics,—things that I know to be untrue,—that I am ready now to join in the philosophy which says that there are three kinds of lies, white lies, black lies, and statistics. No, the figures do not determine the matter. The only strength of the Roman Catholic Church in this country is in her masses (and that too in more senses than one) and her influence upon our life and institutions has been out of all measure small as compared with her numbers in this country. Oh, no, the counting of noses does not determine the message of a Church, any more than the size of a man determines the time of his speech or the length of his hair determines the fullness of his thoughts. No, the message of a Church is a question of positive influence for righteousness, a matter of definite influence upon the life and thought of the nation.

Now the influence of the Lutheran faith upon the life of this nation and upon the institutions of American civilization has *not* been proportionate to her resources in numbers and in religious treasures. I hope you will not regard this as the statement of a pessimist. It is true, and I am not overlooking the fact, that the influence of



our faith has been considerable, much more than most people realize, in all five aspects of our national civilization, the religious, the political, the educational, the social, and the industrial. And it is hoped that this quadricentennial year will set forth in clear and unmistakable terms just what has been the influence of the Lutheran Church and the Lutheran faith in each of these spheres. But while we shall point with pride to the benign influence of our faith in times past, upon the Church, upon the Government, upon the School, upon the Family, and in Industry, must we not admit deep in our hearts that the great Lutheran Church with its two and a half million adherents, with all its treasures of doctrine and faith, ought to have exerted a far more profound influence than it has?

Unless I am greatly mistaken in my analysis of the life and thought of the American people they are predominantly Calvinistic, and their attitude towards God, and towards man, and towards the world, and towards the things in the world, is tremendously Calvinistic. The fruits of faith which the American people as a nation manifest most clearly are not the fruits of the Lutheran faith but the fruits of Calvinism. To show this in detail would be an interesting exercise but it would lead us too far afield. But I will say just this one thing: if any one of you will cross the ocean to the Lutheran countries of Europe and stay there long enough to actually live yourself into the Lutheranism of Sweden, or Norway, or Denmark, or Germany, so that you can look back upon your own country in the perspective of three thousand miles and *thus* view the life and conduct of the American people, it will be as clear to you as the light of day that this country is far more strongly under the influence of the Reformed Churches and the Reformed theology than it is under the influence of the Lutheran Church and the Lutheran theology. The Americans are a race of Marthas rather than a race of Marys. The race-mind of the average twentieth-century American shows very little effect of the influence of the Lutheran faith.

American religious life is characterized to-day by too much *doing* and too little *being*. This is the fruit of Calvinism. A very large part of our Christian population is in danger of forgetting that every Christian has two hands; the one is the hand of faith that goes *upward* and lays hold on God; the other is the hand of love that goes *outward* towards our fellowmen. I say the danger is that this plan of the divine economy will be lost out of sight. The great host of our fellow-Americans in the very name of religion are cutting off their religious supply and are extending *both* hands in love to fellow men. Now this looks lovely enough, but it simply resolves religion into ethics and morality and thus makes religion irreligious. And this in the end means that morality becomes immoral.

Look out over the religious life of our land. Go where you will: look at it from what point you please. It is the same story: The religious life of America is characterized by a constant tendency towards a keener ethical sensitiveness, an increasing emphasis upon the commonplace virtues, such as temperance, and sobriety, and chastity, and industry, and a sense of duty and obligation, and so on, yes, a keener ethical consciousness but a constant diminishing of devout sentiment and personal *religious* devotion. There can be no doubt about it: the Americans, more than any other people under the sun, attack their problems with high moral earnestness and with well-meant ethical considerations. But the trouble is that their moral earnestness is not always enlightened or praise-worthy. It is too often divorced from religious motivation, and thus in the end it vanishes or declines into actual immorality. That's why the religious history of our country has been so uneven in its course. That's why the religious history of our country is characterized by these sporadic spasms of public virtue which many good people mistake for waves of genuine religion. Friends, the religious life of our country is in danger of being dissolved into social and moral uplift, into recreation halls, reading-rooms, free lunches, gymnasiums, swimming-pools, sewing circles, suppers, and banquets,



and feeds, and open forums, and a hundred and one other things that are good enough and all right in themselves, but that are positively wrong and damnable when allowed to take the place of religion.

A few years ago the *Outlook* sent Doctor Abbott all over this country on a tour of personal observation of the religious life of the land. Upon his return from his trip abroad Dr. Abbott said: "I feel as if I have been observing phenomena not of religion but of sociology. If any generalization is justifiable from such evidence as I have gathered, it is that religion in America is characterized not so much by devoutness as by righteousness, less by the look upward than by the look outward."

In the sixteenth century Luther stormed and thundered against the current practice of interposing ceremonies between the individual and his God, and he insisted upon a restoration of vital and personal religion. To-day in America there is a loud call for the voice of a prophet with a very similar message. And I believe that that voice is to be found in the message of the *Lutheran Church to America*. In Luther's day in Germany it was a matter of protesting against *ceremonial* good works which has taken the place of genuine personal religion. In this quadricentennial year in America it is a matter of protesting against the *benevolent* good works that are taking the place of genuine personal religion. For the chief impediment at present to the growth of the devotional spirit in our country is not the commercial spirit of the day but the great increase in the practical activities of the Church *together* with the divorcement of those activities from the spirit of genuine personal religion. That is a thesis that I should be willing to defend by the hour. We need to get our nation back to the Word of God. We need less doing and more being. We need to prevent our religion from becoming a materialistic religion. Too many of our fellow countrymen stand on that low primitive stage of religious development where men seek the gifts of God rather than God himself. They need to be taught to "seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness." They need to be taught that the up-

ward look is always more important than the outward look.

Just that is the message of the Lutheran Church to America. It is a message of prophetism, a preachment of genuine vital religion of the heart.

Calvinism has shown itself incapable of meeting the need. Calvinism has stood in the very midst of the tremendous wealth and the immense material prosperity of our country. But Calvinism has been utterly powerless to tear off the materialistic clothing of our twentieth-century American civilization and to clothe it with vital religion. In fact there is a wide circle of scholarship that claims that Calvinism is actually responsible for the very essence of our materialism. Some of you have read Max Weber's remarkable monograph "Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism" in which with fine penetration he traces the spirit of modern American capitalism to the ethics of Calvinism. We cannot go into that now, although it would be interesting and bears directly upon our subject. But certain it is that there is a yawning gulf between the material prosperity of our country and the old-time Church with its spirit of devotion and its keen sense of personal religion. Calvinism had control of the field when that gulf began to open. She has stood by and has watched the gulf widen. And to-day she looks on powerless to bridge the chasm.

Now right here I am convinced the Lutheran Church has a distinct message to this country. Ours is not a mechanical theology but a vital theology. It is based upon a Person. It gathers about a Person. And it conserves the personality of the individual believer. It is calculated to draw men to God, *all men*. This vital quality in our theology produces a vital religion as distinct from a mechanical religion. The Lutheran type of piety is not based upon a Code, as are so many other forms of piety in our land, types that frame their religious life upon the answers to such questions as "What would Jesus Do?" and such pledges as "Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise Him that I will *do* whatever He would have me *do*," and a hundred



and one other precepts and formulas. No, the Lutheran type of piety binds the individual into close intimate personal fellowship and communion with God through faith in Jesus Christ, and the hand of love takes care of itself. Thus the *whole* life is sanctified and all of its activities are religious activities.

That is the message of the Reformation and it is the message of the Lutheran Church to America to-day: that God is the God of the whole world and every man, and that the whole world is God's world and every man is God's man. Now introduce that message into the religious life of our country and what will be the result? The result will be that the disintegrating influences in the religious life of our country will be overcome, a vitalizing element will have been introduced, our religious forces will be conserved, the religious life of our country will be prevented from vanishing into the thin air of sentimental emotionalism or the gaseous atmosphere of ethical culture or even into the attenuated mist of aesthetic attainment. The religious life of our country will be actually religified! The day of irreligious religion and of immoral ethics will pass. The whole life of man will be filled with the religious principle and every calling will be a sacred calling. In every phase of activity the upward look will be emphasized. And thus the gulf that now yawns between our temporal prosperity and true religion will be bridged.

Well, you ask, is it to be expected that the doctrinal systems of the other Churches must be changed and rewritten in terms of the Lutheran system? By no means. Just as long as we can continue our present relation between Church and State, the relation of friendly independence, just as long as there are many men of many minds, just so long will we have a variety of Churches. Just as long as men are permitted to exercise the right of private judgment and the application of human reason to the interpretation of the Scriptures, just so long will we have a variety of doctrinal systems. I do not expect that every whit of Christianity in America will some day be labelled "Lutheran," but I do expect that the Lutheran

Church will read the other Churches a message of vitalized religion and thus bring them all, each under her own banner, nearer to the great heart of God.

I do not expect that the social order will be revolutionized or that the diversity of the classes from the masses will ever cease. But I do know that it is possible for each man to learn to serve God where he is. It is possible for each man to read in the Church of the Reformation the message that God is in His world and that His kingdom is not a mere desmesne around the pulpit and "the family altar," but an all-inclusive empire, and the force of this impulse will be a mighty contribution to the new era of social and economic invigoration. The Lutheran Church will personalize the religion of every individual man and thus infuse new qualities into the social order.

It is even possible that the methods of other Churches will for the most part remain unchanged by the message and mission of the Lutheran Church. Although there are many indications even already that as other Churches are catching the spirit of the Lutheran Church they are copying also her methods. But the form is of little consequence compared with the content. And the message of the Lutheran Church to America is a message of content rather than form, of life rather than law, namely, a message of vitalized and personalized religion.

There is a loud call right now for the persistent application of strong doses of evangelical Christianity to the religious life of our country. Is there a flood of vice and crime pouring over our life? Yes, but that is not at the root of the trouble; that is only superficial. Is there a strong strain of materialism and scepticism in our public thought to-day? Yes, but *that* is only an effect; it is not the cause. No, the real danger is not that our national life will be poisoned by the death-dealing fumes of iniquity and vice, nor that it will be strangled by the stifling bonds of materialism and irreligion, but there is a real danger, and it's at the very heart of things,—a danger that our national life will be silently but insidiously asphixiated by a thin gaseous form of religion and ethics,



the residue that is left after men have strained out the substantial truths of Christ's Gospel. The religious atmosphere of America needs oxygen. Our nation needs to be called back to the Word of God. Here is the mission of Lutheranism. If the happy-go-lucky superficiality of Americans in matters of faith is to be overcome at all, the Lutheran Church needs to impart to them something of the depth of her own robust faith. If the danger of religious asphyxiation is to be averted from our national life, we must infuse some of our own evangelical oxygen into the American atmosphere. Just that I believe is our message to our nation and our mission to our country. If Christopher Columbus was the discoverer of our country, and if George Washington was the father of our country, and if Abraham Lincoln was the savior of our country,—then I verily believe that the sanctifier of our country will some day be found either directly or indirectly, in the evangelical faith of Lutheranism with its universal appeal.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VI.

ANTICIPATIONS OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN  
THE WRITINGS OF HEATHEN AND JEWISH  
PHILOSOPHERS.

BY PROFESSOR J. M. HANTZ, D.D.

Eusebius, the Father of Ecclesiastical History, is also the author of another well-known work, the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, designed, as its title intimates, to prepare men's minds for the reception of the proper evidences of Christianity, by an examination of the various forms of religious belief current among heathen nations, or sanctioned by heathen philosophers, before the coming of Christ, and by a comparison of them with the doctrine and rites of the Jews founded upon the divine revelation of the Old Testament. He proposes, in this work and in its sequel, the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, to show that the Gentile Christians are justified both on the one hand, in departing from the superstitions of their forefathers to embrace a purer faith, and, on the other hand, in accepting the sacred books of the Jews, and confirming their belief by means of them; and yet, in interpreting those books otherwise than as they were interpreted by the Jews themselves. In his examination of the religious belief of the Greeks as compared with that of the Hebrews, which constitutes the principal portion of the former of these two works, Eusebius candidly acknowledges the difference between the absurd and impious fables of the popular mythology and the nobler and truer theology taught by some of the most distinguished philosophers, and specially by Plato; but he accounts for whatever is excellent in the latter by maintaining that it was borrowed from the sacred books of the Hebrews. (On this opinion as met by Eusebius, see a criticism in the *Literary Remains and Biography of H. F. Clinton*, p. 120).

A full century and more before Eusebius, another learned Father, Clement, of Alexandria, who may per-



haps be regarded as the first who directly attempted to connect Christian doctrine with philosophical principles, spoke, more directly and with a fuller acknowledgment of the value of the Greek Philosophy. "Before the coming of the Lord," he says, "philosophy was necessary to the Greeks for justification; now it is useful to piety, being a kind of preliminary exercise to those who obtain faith through demonstration." "We cannot err," he continues, "if we refer what is good, whether it be Greek or Christian, to Providence. For God is the cause of all that is good, sometimes immediately or principally, as of the Old and New Covenants; sometimes by consequence, as of philosophy. Perhaps it was given even immediately to the Greeks, before the Lord called them: it was to them a schoolmaster, as the Law to the Hebrews, to lead them to Christ. It is preparatory, opening the way to him who is afterwards perfected by Christ. (Clem. Alex. Strom. I. 5, p. 331. Potter Translated by Bp. Kaye, Clem. Alex. p. 116). This theory assuredly will find but little favor with any competent judge of evidence in the present day; and its general reception by the Christian Fathers is sometimes regarded as one of the most flagrant instances of their deficiency in critical acumen. Yet, however untenable the supposition may be, it is, to say the least, not more absurd in itself and not more destitute of any reasonable foundation than the counter theory which has been elaborated by the higher-critical ingenuity of some modern writers who have not scrupled to assert that nearly all the distinctive doctrines of the Christian Faith are due to the influence of Greek Philosophy upon the Jewish mind. The one is the honest, though ill-informed prejudice of men zealous with a mistaken zeal for the honor of divine revelation; the other is the less excusable perverseness of men of more enlightened age, determined, by all means and at all hazards, to wrest from the Christian faith every trace and vestige of its divine origin.

The interest which has been excited by recent discussions concerning the relation of Heathen and Jewish philosophy to Christian theology, and the erroneous views



which in some quarters have been propagated in connection with it, as regards the origin and character of the Christian religion, is one reason, though not the only one, which will, I trust, justify my selection of this subject as an appropriate introduction to and preparation for the study of ecclesiastical history. In truth, had no such discussions taken place, the subject itself is one of sufficient interest and importance to warrant us in regarding it, not indeed exactly in the sense intended by Eusebius, but in one not less real, though adapted to requirements of a later age, as a *Preparatio Evangelica*, as a preliminary study, important to the right appreciation of the character of the Christian Faith and of the Christian Church. For the history of the church is not solely or principally a narrative of events; however important the events may be which it is the duty of the Church historian to narrate, it is at least in an equal degree a history of men's thoughts and beliefs, an account of doctrine and development of doctrine, which, whether without or within the pale of the Catholic Communion, whether in the form of heresies perverting the doctrine of the Church or of confessions and controversies on the part of the Church herself which those heresies necessarily called forth, connects itself intimately with the contemporaneous course and previous history of philosophy, with the laws and tendencies of the human mind of which philosophy is the offspring, and with the traditional current of previous thoughts, by which those tendencies are modified and directed in each successive age. If the Church, in her growth and progress from generation to generation, touches on one side the civil history of empires and kingdoms, she touches no less on another side the intellectual history of schools and systems of thought. If the day when "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed," commenced a new epoch in the annals of the world's empires, and marked the rise of a new kingdom, in the world though not of the world, henceforth to exist side by side with the newly-formed empire of the Caesars, growing with its growth, abiding through its decline and fall, waxing greater from its ruins, and moulding the na-



tionalities which sprang from them, a kingdom set up by the God of heaven to stand forever, when the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold were to be broken to pieces together, and become like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors,—no less distinctly was the day when the command was given, “Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” to mark the introduction into the world of men’s hearts and minds of a new rule of thought and belief, henceforth to move on side by side with every movement of human philosophy, at one time neglected and despised by it; at another, presented in its name; at another, resisting it to the death; at another, triumphing over it and moulding it to its will. And if it be true that, as regards the civil history of the world, the Son of God was manifested “in the fulness of the time,” when the Jewish law and nation had fulfilled their purpose and were about to pass away; when the Roman dominion had reached a boundary beyond which it would bear no further enlargement,” (Tacitus Ann. I, 11, Cf. Juliani Caesari Opera p. 326, C. Spanheim), and established an intercommunion between alien races and distant localities, by which, without or against the will of its rulers, the new faith was enabled to take root firmly and spread its branches widely; when the Greek language had established itself as a medium of intercourse among all the nations of the civilized world; when the institutions of society, powerless to renovate themselves, had sunk into that state of utter corruption in which neither the vices could be endured nor the remedies, and no help could be looked for, except from a special and divine interposition; it is no less true that the same need, and the same preparation for the consciousness and acknowledgment of that need, may be traced in gradual and progressive formation through the various evolutions and developments of human philosophy; as system follows system, and schools come forth in succession or antagonism to each other, bearing witness on the part of all alike to a common yearning and a common inability to satisfy it or even to give it definite utterance; till at last every possible com-



bination of philosophical principles and methods was exhausted, and human reason no less than human society, was taught by constant failures and utter despair, that its renovation must come from without and not from within, from God and not from man.

It has been a favorite topic among the opponents of revelation at various times, pre-eminently among the Deists of the last century, but in no small degree also among their successors in the present, to talk of a "Christianity as old as Creation," of an absolute or universal religion founded on the principles of human reason; of religious truth evolved from within, not revealed from without. In point of fact, however, this natural religion has never existed, except where Christianity has been before it; it has been constructed, not by the spontaneous efforts of reason unassisted by revelation, but by reason dividing revelation and throwing a portion of it away. What human reason under the light of modern civilization could have done had the Christian revelation never been given, is a question which it is impossible to answer, because Christianity actually has come, and has determined by its coming the whole subsequent course of human reason and modern civilization. The Divine elements, once infused into the current of human thought, can never afterwards be separated from it; it mingles with the very analysis by which the separation is attempted, no less than with the materials on which that analysis has to operate. The only true instances of the religion of nature and of natural theology are to be found in those modes of thought and belief which actually existed in the Gentile world before the coming of Christ, or which exist still in those regions in which the Christian Faith has not prevailed. In tracing the course of Greek Philosophy down to the time of the Christian era, we may see the utmost that ever was actually done, in a high state of civilization, by some of the grandest and most richly endowed intellects that have ever appeared among the sons of men, to lead men's minds to truth and their wills to virtue—in the state of belief and practice actually prevalent, we see the amount of success by which these efforts were at-



tended. The speculative side of this inquiry, which is that which I propose to pursue in the present inquiry, will exhibit to us a picture of Philosophy, in the hands of her greatest representatives, struggling to emancipate the religious ideas of a people from the degrading superstitions of the popular mythology; but it will also show us how the success of the effort in one direction was perpetually accompanied by a corresponding failure in another; how religious ideas, as they become more and more elevated in an intellectual point of view, lost in the same proportion their influence on the feelings; how worship and contemplation varied inversely with each other, the one decreasing as the other increased; how philosophy, in proportion as she shook off from herself the crude anthropomorphisms of a poetical theology, lost her hold at the same time on the idea of a Personal God, to rest upon an abstract First Principal or a pantheistic One and All, or a purposeless Chance, or an inexorable Fate; till a system is consciously and distinctly elaborated in which worship becomes an unmeaning pageant and prayer a vain delusion in which the free will of man can be vindicated only by the denial of divine Providence, and the assertion of a Providence must be made at the cost of man's moral responsibility. We shall see at the same time how that which is the basis of all religion, the consciousness of man's relation to God as a Person to a Person, vanishes by the destruction, not of one only but of both its constituent ideas; how after the personality of God is banished from philosophy, the personality of man cannot long remain behind it; but disappears under the image of a passing moment in the evolution of the universe, or a fortuitous concourse of material atoms. We shall have occasion also, in the course of this inquiry, to notice those apparent anticipations of some of the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity, which arose from the union between the Greek Philosophy and the Jewish Religion; and to examine the real value of the hypothesis which endeavors by means of them to find a merely human origin for the Christian Revelation. The result of the inquiry will, we believe, be to show that the position of Christi-

anity in the history of the human mind, as related to previous systems of thought and belief, is neither that of a violated and unconnected phenomenon, having no discernible relation to the previous records and efforts of the struggling soul, nor yet (far from it) that of a mere consummation of human philosophy, the last and highest results of a series of gradually advancing development of human reason; but rather that it is the divine answer to a human question, the divine satisfaction of a human want; that it interposes in the midst of the debate of contending schools and conflicting theories, as the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind when his disputing friends had found no answer; and interposes moreover in the same spirit, revealing God and His good pleasure towards us sufficiently to save our souls if we will believe, but not to solve all doubts if we will dispute." (Sanderson's Works, I. p. 234).

There is no epoch in the history of philosophy more interesting in itself, or more important in its relation to the subsequent history of the Church and her teaching than that at which the Greek philosophy and the Hebrew revelation came in contact with each other at Alexandria under the Ptolemies. From that contact sprang a system of religious philosophy destined under Christian influences to leaven the history of the Church through successive generations both for evil and for good—in its misuse the fruitful parent of heresies; in its legitimate employment furnishing one of the most effective weapons for the overthrow of heresy and the defense of the truth. On the one side, its influence may be seen in the Alexandrian forms of Gnosticism, in Cerinthus, in Basilides, in Valentinus and his followers. (Cf. Neander Vol. II. pp. 42-107, ed. Bohn, Gieseler Vol. I. p. 134 *seq.*), and again in opposite forms in the Sabillian and Arian heresies; (Cf. Mosheim in Harrison's *Cudworth* Vol. II. pp. 320, 376, 410. Dr. Holmes in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*, ed. Alexander, Vol. III. p. 516. Petavius *Dogm. Theol. De Trinitate*, I., 2:2); but on the other side, it passed into the teaching of the Church through Clement and Origen, and became in their hands an instrument for refuting the false gnosis by means of



the true; while in the next century, it contributed to furnish the armory from which Athanasius equipped himself for his conflict with Arianism. Leavening theological controversy, consciously or unconsciously, in periods and among nations most remote from each other, it may be traced in the argument by which Basil and the two Gregories and Chrysostom combatted the heresy of Eunomius, and in those by which Stillingfleet and Norris and Browne contended against the revival of Eunomianism in the *Christianity not Mysterior* of Toland. Outside the pale of the Church, it appears conspicuously in the Neo-Platonic philosophy, a system which, while professing to be a revival and development of the genuine teaching of Plato, bears unmistakable traces of having borrowed the principle of its interpretation from those Christian dogmas which it could only rival by plundering. But though the Alexandrian system, blending as it does, in union or in antagonism, the doctrine of revelation with the speculations of philosophy, constitutes the point from which we may most distinctly trace the combined influence of both elements upon theology within and without the Church, it is not in their state of fusion that the two elements can be clearly distinguished from each other, and the separate value of each properly estimated. To know what Philosophy can do for herself without enlightenment from Revelation, it will be necessary to pursue the stream of thought backward to its earlier and purely heathen sources, to note the course which it takes and the volume which it gathers while fed solely from the rill of human reason, ere its waters acquire a wider compass and a different hue from their confluence with those which come down to it from another fountain. It is with this object, that I propose, in a series of articles, to attempt a slight sketch of the course of Greek philosophy, from the time when it first distinctly assumes a theological character down to the time at which it comes in contact with the Scripture, first of the Old Testament and then of the New, in the Judaism of Alexandria and in the teaching of the Christian Church. Commencing with a subject with which my readers, I believe, will have more or less ac-



quaintance, I would hope to be enabled, without any abrupt transition to a new theme, to give a new interest in what I have hitherto attempted, in other articles, to teach in another aspect and from another point of view, to exhibit the Gentile philosophy in that feature which to us constitutes its chief claim on our attention, its relation to Him who is "the Desire of all nations"; to point out the successive steps taken by it for the accomplishment of that end which the Apostle, speaking in the headquarters of ancient philosophy, declared to be the purpose of God in assigning to the several nations of the earth their appointed times and the bounds of their habitation,—“that they should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after Him and find Him.”

Such an inquiry, though not a part of ecclesiastical history, strictly so-called, may yet be regarded as an appropriate introduction to it. We may adopt with reference to it the title prefixed to his work by a distinguished German theologian, Ullman, who has traversed the same ground, Heathenism and Judaism—A Porch to the History of Christianity. “The History of Christianity,” as the same writer has observed, “necessarily presumes for the bare understanding of it, an acquaintance with the history of the Pagan and the Jew.” To understand that history, we must ask and answer the questions:—What soil did Christianity find to build on? To what doctrine and systems of thought could it attach itself? What circumstances paved the way for it, and forwarded and facilitated its expansion? What obstacles, prejudices and errors had it to overcome? What adversaries to encounter? What evils to remedy? How did Paganism react on Christianity? One portion at least of these important questions will furnish the principal subject of our present inquiry—namely: What was the soil on which Christianity had to build, what were the doctrines and systems of thought to which it could attach itself.

How such a Church as this at once One and Universal, ever became a reality, is the wonder of the world's history. The very idea bore the impress of more than human originality. All previous religions were opposed to



it; all previous aspirations after unity (if aspirations they can be called) had been shattered at the moment of their contact with the sober realities of life. No philosophy, however lofty, but dispersed into schools in the hands of its first disciples; no theosophy, however ethereal, but engendered in the minds of its votaries the restlessness of an ungoverned fancy. Sects, mysteries, philosophies, rose, sparkled and burst, like bubbles upon the stream of time. Nothing attained to permanence which was not rooted in the firm soil of nationality. Christianity, when it declared itself universal, defied the whole experience of mankind; and, historically speaking, the great marvel of Christianity is that it succeeded in providing an adequate ground-work for this universal cohesion.

It will be seen, in special instances in the history of Greek thought, how the loftiest and purest philosophy, not only dispersed into schools in the generation following its first teacher, but also how its original loftiness and purity, once lost, was never recovered; how its highest aspirations stand out in solitary grandeur, as the products of individual genius, powerless, whatever there might be in them of the true and beautiful, to attract the homage and command the assent of other seekers after truth. It will be seen how even such fundamental doctrines of natural religion as the possibility of God and the future life of man, doctrines which now seem as self-evident to man's natural reason, did not, as a matter of fact, form the basis of a common belief for any philosophical community, till enforced with divine authority in the teaching of the Church. If we should be permitted hereafter to pursue the same inquiry through later ages, when philosophy and Christian theology have come into contact with each other, and flow side by side, sometimes mingled, sometimes in separate currents, we shall find, if I mistake not, the same view confirmed by experience of another kind. Throughout this later history we shall find, I believe, on the one hand within the Church, a view of Catholic thought, even upon purely speculative questions, which, with freedom and difference upon matters of



detail, preserves yet a certain unity of method and principle, unknown to earlier speculations; and, on the other hand, in systems altogether separate from or opposed to the Church, the same marks of individuality and isolation, the same inability to serve and fix any permanent truth for the use of future generations, which characterizes the earlier course of pre-Christian inquiry. If a heathen philosophy, in the days when the light of heathen philosophy was at its zenith or but first beginning to descend from it, could enunciate as the characteristic of truth and error respectively, τὸ μὲν ἁμαρτάνειν πολλαχῶς ἐστίν, τὸ δὲ κατορθοῦν μοναχῶς, the principle, however, self-evident in the abstract, is one of which the whole range of heathen philosophy before the coming of Christ, and the whole range of un-Christian and anti-Christian philosophy since that epoch, may be challenged in vain to produce a single concrete application. In reading the history of successive systems, not each building securely upon the foundation of truth established by its predecessor, but each busied in removing some portion of that foundation, almost as soon as it is laid, in making some great truth as we now know it to be, just emerging for a moment from the troubled waves of conflicting thought, and overwhelmed the next moment beneath them, we are incessantly reminded of the poetic myth, in which Plato shadows forth the history and destiny of the human soul, following the track of the Gods as they guide their winged chariots under the vault of heaven, permitted at times, for a brief period, to lift its head above the summit of the vault, and to obtain a hurried and partial glimpse of the supercelestial region where truth has her dwelling; and then in the next revolution of the heavens, cast down with broken wings to earth, to feed on the unreal banquet of vain opinions. Yet if mere human genius could have founded an universal philosophy, where shall we find human genius more exalted, more entitled to claim authority over the thought of men than in the two great masters of Greek thought.

“Si Pergama dextra

Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.”



If unity, grounded on truth could have been established by the highest powers or the most gigantic efforts of man's unassisted reason, never was philosophy more richly equipped for the attainment of it than that which numbered at the head of its thinkers a Plato and an Aristotle.

It was necessary that the gifts and powers of human intellect should be tried to the utmost and should fail in the trial, to show clearly that that which succeeded when they failed is of God and not of man. It was necessary that the edifices of human architecture should arise in all their beauty, to show what human skill can do, should crumble away, almost as soon as built, to show what human skill cannot do, in order that a site should be prepared for that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Ere we enter upon the history of that divinely-founded Society, which for nineteen centuries of its earthly existence has been bound together by the confession of one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, it may be not without profit to trace for a short time the tangled paths of those who, amidst the distracting claims of God's many and Lords many, were painfully and darkly striving after that unity which their interests never ceased to yearn for, even while their understandings were bewildered in the unsuccessful search. It is a tortuous and disappointing course, turning back upon itself when nearest to the goal, and wandering further and further in darkness with each succeeding effort. Yet when man was at the farthest from God, God was bringing Himself nearest to man; the period of the greatest darkness of heathen philosophy, was that which immediately preceded the rising of the Sun of Righteousness; the time when the searchings of man's restless intellect seemed most hopeless and most remote from their object was that in which it was about to be proclaimed, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, lo here, or lo there, for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

*Alliance, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

The Rev. Frederick W. Palmer of Auburn, N. Y., writes of "Superfluous Churches" in *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (July). He illustrates his subject by quoting from the Census reports the following statistics in reference to churches in central New York. In the hamlet S. are a Methodist Church with 32 members, an Episcopal with 22, and a Unitarian with 17, The village of C. supports two Baptist and three Methodist churches with a total membership of 227. In the town of W. are three churches with a combined membership of 53. In 35 towns of adjoining counties there are 52 churches with not over 50 communicants each.

Mr. Palmer gives three reasons which justify the existence of a Church with less than 100 members: (1) When situated in a sparsely settled region and ministering to those otherwise without adequate privileges. (2) When there is a constituency of differing antecedents or language, e. g., Roman Catholic, Friends, or Foreigners. (3) When an already existing Church cannot furnish religious privileges to the surrounding Christian public because of offensively peculiar usages and tenets or its unwelcome attitude toward outsiders.

The author finds that ordinarily two self-supporting Churches in a fairly populous community, say of about 2,500, accomplish more than one. In a group of counties studied the members of the two Churches constituted 22.3 per cent. of the population, while of the one only 8.4 per cent.

The burden of proof for the establishing of a new Church must rest upon it. The official leaders of the denominations should repress the establishment of needless Churches. In 1914 the Presbyterian Synod of New York expressed its disapproval of the appropriating of Home



Mission Funds for the support of a Church in a community of 500 or fewer persons where there exists another Church of an evangelical body, recognized by the Federal Council, better fitted to minister to the spiritual needs of the community, except in the case of missions among foreign-speaking or other exceptional groups of people.

---

“The Church and the Alien” is aptly presented by Bishop Cooke, in the *Methodist Review* (July-August). We quote as follows:

In these United States there are about eight million Germans. Omitting all aliens who may be propagandists of foreign intrigue and diplomacy, and those who by attempting to divide opinion in this country come perilously near being guilty of treason, the sane, panic-proof people of the United States, and certainly millions of people in all our churches, will not be so utterly lost to reason as to imagine that these millions of Germans, Austrians, and Bulgarians—these our German brothers in our churches and annual conferences—are responsible for the acts of the German Government. Nor will they assume without evidence that these Germans and others are in full sympathy with the atrocities committed on land and sea which excite the moral execration of the world, however much they may be excused under the pitiable plea of military necessity, an excuse which would justify every crime under heaven. To excuse is to condemn! Our German citizens are not responsible for the acts nor for the methods nor the arguments of the German Government; and no one has the right to create suspicion of his neighbors, to surround them with an atmosphere of disloyalty, injuring them in their business and daily toil, isolating them in social intercourse, and thus not only persecute cruelly innocent people, people who love our institutions and the starry flag which is their children’s flag, but also create a state of wild, unreasoning ferment of fear and race hatred throughout the whole land. The one imperative need in this country to-day is unity—one people, one government, one language, one flag, one destiny!

Nor can we say with any knowledge of the secret ways



of governments that even all the people of Germany are responsible for or indorse the acts or the Schrecklichkeit method of the German Government. The attacks of the Socialists in the Reichstag on the policy of Prussia are sufficient evidence that those acts and policies are not universally indorsed. The conflict over methods between the partisans of the Imperial Chancellor Bethman-Hollweg and those of Tirpitz is evidence that in the government itself there is wide difference of opinion. The people are no more directly responsible for this war than they were for the attack on Austria in 1866, nor for the Franco-German War in 1870. It was not the people who forged the Ems telegram which precipitated that war. Responsible writers and public speakers, if they knew history, will draw wide distinction between the people and the government of the people. This war is not a people's war, however the government and its press may make the people think it is. Nor is it wholly the immediate product of Pan-German dreams of state philosophers, of military camarillas, political cliques, economic leaders, and university professors.

But no matter. For the sake of peace in our own country during this national emergency the diplomatic squabbles of the old world are not to be fought out here. This is not Europe. This is America. If suspicion and distrust against English and French and Germans, Bulgars, Poles, Italians, Belgians, or others are engendered among us, our mines and factories and workshops, whole neighborhoods of divers nationalities in all our large cities and even small communities in the far West will be torn and rent in partisan strife. Here, then, above all else, is the opportunity of the Church. The Church can now do a work which will make it easier for her to evangelize the foreign element when the war is over. For hatred between men, let her substitute forbearance and love; for suspicion, brotherly trust; for enmity and revenge among neighbors, Christian kindness and magnanimity. The Church of the Crucified whose Golgotha to-day is the world—I am writing this on Friday—is the reconciler of humanity. The Christian man will serve



his Lord and his country best by showing a Christian spirit toward foreign-speaking peoples and aliens. Jesus calls us to the higher patriotism, the patriotism of the kingdom of God. Millions of our foreigners in our crowded cities are yet to be evangelized. We dare not alienate them now and try to win them later. Let us be wise. If the Church of God in America fails to act toward all men of every race and color and tongue in the light of eternity, then the Church as an organized institution of religion will not only have failed to serve the nation in its hour of need, it will also have failed our Lord Himself and lost its chance with the aliens when the war is over.

---

“Why Send Missionaries to the Heathen?” is the question asked and answered by the Rev. Edward N. Harris, a Foreign Missionary, in *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (July). He concludes as follows:

To return to the question with which I began this article, I have pointed out the utter hopelessness and inadequacy of Buddhism,—and by inference of every other heathen religion,—as a means of salvation. I have shown that although it has a profound sense of condemnation, its conception of sin is shallow and its code of morals perverted. I have given reasons for believing,—and this is a conviction which I am confident would be confirmed by intelligent and reflective converts from Buddhism,—that its direction is away from God rather than towards God; that so far from its being an attempt to see the source of all light and truth, it is a carefully constructed scheme to get away from the light and blind the eye against it. The heathen do not desire to know God. They wish rather to keep away from him and obliterate from their minds the consciousness of His presence. This is the true philosophy of their religions, and in their heart of hearts they know it. The old missionary incentive is still in place. We need to send the gospel to the heathen in order that they may be saved.

The objection is sometimes made that by sending missionaries to the heathen we are taking away their own



faiths and too often putting nothing in their stead. I think I have made it sufficiently clear that these various systems of religion ought not to be called faiths, for they are systems not so much of belief as of unbelief. But even if they are conceded to be faiths of a kind, I have this to say, that, in so far as supplanting old faiths without putting a new faith in their stead is concerned, in my opinion others are more responsible for this than are the missionaries. In Burma and India, at least, I think that much more is being done along this line by British officials and European tradespeople than by the missionaries, for no one can be without an influence of one kind or another; and, while the influence of these people is not for the most part in favor of Christianity, oftentimes being quite the contrary, yet it does tend powerfully to the disintegration, in some respects at least, of the ancient systems of the people of those lands. Missionaries do not as a rule supplant ancient beliefs except as they introduce far better beliefs in their place. But in so far as the work of the missionaries does tend to do this, I think it will be admitted, in view of what I stated regarding the origin and nature of heathen religions, that even so the heathen is better off; for without any system, without any religion to keep him from God, he is placed in a position where he is more open to the truth.

In closing, I may say that, if now we turn to the converts from heathenism and ask for their testimony, with one acclaim they will answer, "Why send the gospel to the heathen? Because it has saved us. It has lifted us up out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and it has put a new song into our mouths, even praise unto our God."

---

Prof. Wm. J. Hinke of Auburn Seminary writes very discriminately on "The Protestant Reformation" in *The Reformed Church Review* (July).

From this central principle the priesthood of all believers of the Reformation all the other positions of the Reformers become at once obvious and follow by necessity. The most important of these is the conception of the Holy Scriptures as the ultimate source of authority in religion.



This conception is often presented in such a way as to rob it of its religious meaning. It is said that the Reformers substituted for the infallible Church an infallible Book. And it is implied that the same kind of infallibility was transferred to the Book, which was thought to belong to the Church. Such a statement overlooks however two important facts. First that neither the term "Scriptures" nor the term "Infallibility" had the same meaning among Protestants and Catholics.

As to the Scriptures it should be noted that the Catholic Church includes in the Canon all the books known as apocryphal, rejected by Protestants and that it regards as the authoritative form the Latin translation as adopted by the Church while the Protestants go back to the original texts. More important than this external difference was one that had reference to the contents of Scripture.

To the Catholic theologians the Scriptures were a collection of fragmentary texts, without any inherent unity. The Bible was to them a sort of storehouse, in which were kept doctrinal truths and rules for moral conduct. In order to get unity into this collection the Church adopted the dogmatic tradition, which it had developed and placed alongside the Scriptures and treated as an equal source of authority with Scriptures. Moreover, since certain parts of Scripture, as genealogical lists and simple historic narratives, could not easily be turned into doctrinal truths or moral lessons, a fourfold sense of Scripture was adopted, literal, allegorical, moral and anagogic, by which any text could be made to say most anything that was desired. Finally, faith, according to the mediaeval theologians, was not trust in a person, but assent to correct propositions about God, man and human destiny, and the saving character of the assent depended upon the correctness of the propositions assented to. The Church through its theologians, confirmed by Councils, guaranteed the infallibility of the propositions deduced from the Scriptures regarding God and Man. If such is the conception of the Scriptures and such the conception of faith, the answer which John Nathan, Luther's teacher, gave to him at one time becomes perfectly natural and intelli-



ble. He said to his perplexed pupil at one time: "Brother Martin, let the Bible alone; read the old teachers; reading the Bible simply breeds unrest." Thus there was placed between the inquiring soul of man and God, who revealed Himself in the Bible, the interpretation of the Church which barred the way to the heart and mind of God.

The attitude of the Reformers towards the Scriptures was totally different. To them God was speaking in the Bible as one speaks to his fellowmen. The Scriptures were to them the record and the pictures of blessed spiritual experiences of the past, such as they themselves had experienced in their own lives. Hence they were so eager to translate the Bible into the language of the common people, in order that they might know the way of salvation and reproduce in their own lives the same experience of communion and fellowship with God.

This change of view regarding the Scriptures was so radical that it may well be called a rediscovery of the Scriptures. The Reformers were led to it by their conception of faith. It was, as we have seen, a personal trust in a personal God, who has manifested Himself in the life and work of His Son. This made the Word of God to them a personal, not a dogmatic revelation. There was on the one hand the loving Father, pouring out all the treasures of his life in the life of His Son; and on the other hand there was the soul of man, looking through all the works and words recorded to God Himself. Hence, to them the chief function of the Scriptures was to bring Christ to men and as Jesus is the full revelation of God, the chief end of the Bible must be to bring God near to every believer. It is a direct message of love to man's soul. Not a system of doctrine as much a promise of God's nearness and interest in man's welfare. To the Reformers the recognition of the authoritative character of Scripture was not dependent upon the sanction of the Church, given to the Canon, but upon the Spirit of God, operating in man. Just as God makes us realize and feel the sense of pardon by an inward experience of faith, so the Spirit of God enables believers to recognize that God



speaks to us authoritatively through the words of Scripture. Thus the authority of Scripture is not an external creed, but an internal experience. The Christian recognizes Scripture as authoritative because through it he feels God speaking to him. It may be not with equal clearness and distinctness in every part. In the book of Psalms more clearly than in Chronicles, in the words of Christ more clearly than in the Acts of the Apostles, but all through it is God in history and human experience, as God works and operates on the reader's heart.

---

In the same review is found an article on "The Reformed Church in the U. S.," from the pen of Dr. William C. Schaffer. We quote the following interesting paragraphs:

Faith in Jesus Christ, as Lord and Saviour, is the cardinal doctrine of the Reformed Church in the United States. Her characteristic confession comes nearer to the primitive creed of the Apostolic Church, which, as is well known, was simply, "Jesus is Lord" (Rom. 10:9, Phil. 2:11), than is generally known. What she demands of her people is loyalty to Jesus; and she is willing to fellowship with all who prove that loyalty by a life of holiness and service. To all who prove their loyalty in this way, she is willing to grant large freedom of thought in all earnest search after the truth. And she invites to her communion table, not simply the members of her own communion, irrespective of congregational connection, and not simply members of other Protestant denominations, but all persons in good and regular standing in any churches that believe in Jesus Christ and accept him as Lord and Saviour.

All this, of course, does not mean that the Reformed Church in the United States does not have her own peculiar type of doctrine, or that she is indifferent to it. Her Catechism is openly and frankly Calvinistic. It teaches the sovereignty of God and the dependence and sinfulness of man. She has her mode of baptism, but she does not make it a *sine qua non* of church membership. She has her views of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper

and of the efficacy of the sacraments; but she does not insist on the acceptance of these as a condition for the admission of the individual to the Holy Communion. She has her own well defined views on the divinity of her Lord, and she diligently teaches these to her people and to the children in her catechetical classes; but she does not set up a metaphysical standard even here, which a man must apprehend and accept, before she will assure him of salvation. All she insists on is that a man shall believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, accept Him as Lord and Saviour, and yield to Him loyal obedience and loving service; and she is willing to welcome him to her membership and admit him to her communion. Or as stated above, the three things on which she insists are the acknowledgment of the sinfulness of man, faith in Jesus as Lord and Saviour, and cheerful obedience and loving service in His kingdom.

---

*The Princeton Theological Review* (July), contains an able defense of "The Reasonableness of Vicarious Atonement" by Prof. Wm. Brenton Greene, Jr., of Princeton. The following is an abstract from his article:

The present war is often referred to as the illustration and the proof of the failure of Christian Ethics. Were the latter not powerless, it would at least have ameliorated the horrors of the war, if it could not have prevented them. This powerlessness, we are further told, is not due to any defect in Christian Ethics itself, but to "the outworn dogmas" with which it is associated. Among these archaic and paralyzing dogmas the one to which exception is taken most frequently and most strenuously is "the absurd and revolting dogma of Vicarious Atonement"; and because both of its importance in the Christian system and of its "irrational and monstrous" character, it is widely held responsible for the alleged powerlessness of Christian Ethics. However good in itself the latter may be, it must fail with such an incubus around its neck.

It is the aim, therefore, of this paper, first, to show what is meant by vicariousness, especially in relation to



the doctrine of atonement; secondly, to establish that nature is a cosmos or system of reason; thirdly, to prove that vicariousness enters into the warp and woof of nature and, therefore, cannot be unreasonable; and, fourthly, to point out its essential reasonableness. Thus we should demonstrate, not only that the doctrine of vicarious atonement is not an incubus to Christian Ethics, but that it is precisely from "this monstrous dogma of the vicarious sacrifice of the Son of God" that Christian Ethics draws its power. It is the constraining love of such that is, a vicarious, Saviour that is the secret of the Christian life.

1. What, then, is vicariousness?—It consists in acting or in experiencing for another or for others. "The degree to which this is done may vary all the way from substitution in the most exhaustive sense, as when one literally, whether by choice or by compulsion, consciously or unconsciously, takes the place of another, for good or evil, to mere representativeness; as when one represents another and decides for him, and even to action in another's account yet not in any manner of substitution or representativeness." Practically there is no difficulty in recognizing the thing even in its faintest expression. Such is vicariousness in general.

2. Nature is a cosmos or system of reason. We do not hold with the idealist that it is only a system of thought-relations, but we do hold with the idealist that it is a system of thought-relations. The proof of this is that we can grow in the understanding of it and are reducing it to science. We can classify its facts. We can describe its processes. To a limited extent we can predict its future. That we do not have wider and more exact knowledge of it, we feel to be due, not to any lack of correspondence between it and our reason, but to want of capacity on our part. It is adapted to the categories of our understanding; but they are not big enough and delicate enough to comprehend and appreciate it. Hence, when we confront mystery in the constitution and course of the world, as we all do all the time and more and more, we never give over trying to resolve the mystery. We never



suppose that it could not be assimilated with what we know and be explained by it, if only we knew enough; but we believe, and we cannot help believing, that if we knew enough, we should find nature in all its parts the expression of reason. We do not need to become Hegelians to discover the world to be such at bottom that we study it and enjoy it and live in it as we do.

3. Vicariousness enters into the warp and woof of nature. Society depends for its existence on vicariousness. It is because of, and largely as it was determined by, the preceding state of society. Men act for those, and to this extent in the place of those, who shall come after them; and this is the more significant because they do it unintentionally and often unconsciously. They cannot help doing it. Here is the truth in the doctrine of evolution. What is cannot but be conditioned by what was, and in so far forth at least it is evolved out of it. African society is totally different from what it would have been, had it grown out of the society of mediaeval Europe. Thus no age can live to itself. Each age acts, though without appreciating it, for all that follow; and they prosper or suffer accordingly. This is vicariousness. It is one taking the place of others in the sense of acting for them.

Vicariousness appears more strikingly in the family. Parents act vicariously for their children; and they do so, whether they mean to or not. As the family is constituted, it could not be otherwise. The god father's good name must become the heritage of his children. Drunken parents must entail their enfeebled constitution and their tendency to vice on their offspring. Heredity is one of the best established and most strongly emphasized facts of modern science, and heredity is the scientific name for vicariousness. Nature declares as plainly and forcibly as Scripture does that "God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate Him, and shows loving kindness unto a thousand generations of them that love Him and keep His commandments." (Ex. xx:5, 6).

Vicariousness is seen in the nation. This has a life of



its own distinct from that of the race or of the family or of the individual. Hence, it has a unity of its own. A national sentiment is formed. National characteristics appear. There is a national conscience which can be appealed to and which sometimes acts vigorously. Now in this great form of society, the nation, representation, and in so far forth vicariousness, prevails. The men of one time in this national life act for those of another to all intents as if they stood in their place. They determine for them nationally. Their counsels, their actions, often their sufferings, are in large part for those who shall come after them.

4. The reasonableness of this "outworn" doctrine, and especially its singularly high ethical character and tendency, appear in the following particulars:

(1). It is a possible doctrine. That is penalty or reward can be transferred from one person to another consistently with justice. This does not mean that moral character can be so transferred. There is no more self-evident truth than that virtue and vice are personal and only personal. Neither is, or can be, vicarious. Morally, a young man is what he himself is, not what his father is. The latter may be the most pious man that ever lived; but while the tendency of this should be to make the son pious, and while it will inure to his advantage in other ways, it will not be in any sense his piety. The father will wish that it should be, but he cannot have it so. No one can be virtuous with the virtue of another. This is just as true in our relation to God.

---

"The Progress of Federation" by Dr. Charles S. Macfarland is presented in *The American Journal of Theology* (July). He says in part:

At the special meeting of the Council at Washington, President Henry Churchill King expressed the belief that the Council had been born for just such a national hour as this. Previous to this the chaplains in the army and navy have been appointed rather indiscriminately, often through political channels, and without very much concern on the part of the churches. Now the Secretaries of

War and the Navy have at their hand in Washington a body representing all the churches with which they can deal. When the missionaries in Japan have occasion to plead their cause before the American churches, they have a body to whom they can come. When the Red Cross needs the service of Christian people, the organization turns instinctively to the Federal Council. The Protestant churches of war-stricken Europe find an open door to American Christianity. The persecuted Jews can here seek consideration for their wrongs. The religious census department finds it necessary to keep in constant communication with the Washington office of the Council. The social workers, the officers of the organization for war relief, and similar toilers in the world's work are our daily visitors.

Progress, to be sure, is not necessarily indicated by statistics, and yet, perhaps, they indicate something. Four years ago the quadrennial reports constituted one moderate volume; the reports of the quadrennium just closed constitute six rather voluminous books.

Especially since the beginning of the war the relationships between the churches of America and Europe have deepened, and it is interesting to note that invitations have come to the Federal Council from Holland and France to send messengers and counselors to help the Protestant churches of these countries toward more intimate co-operative organization and action.

---

*The Review and Expositor* (July) contains an article on "Dante" by Dr. Stalker of Aberdeen, Scotland. He gives good advice on how to read this illustrious author.

In reading the Divine Comedy a beginner finds many impediments. The architectural plan of the different places is not easy to master, especially of the Inferno; and one is confused with the various means by which the pilgrim is conveyed from one point to another. Then, there is a profusion of allegory and this, which pleased the mind of our ancestors, as we see, for example, in our own Spenser, is to the modern man a weariness of the flesh. Lastly, the reference to the history of the Middle Ages,



and especially to the history of the Italian cities and states, would require for their complete elucidation an extent and minuteness of knowledge not possessed by one in ten thousand even of the educated. But the best way is to pay no attention to these difficulties, but read on. Imperceptibly they disappear, and one acquires such familiarity with the whole as enables one to perceive which things ought to be mastered at whatever cost and which can be neglected without loss. To students of Church History the historical difficulties gradually clear up. Indeed, there is no better preparation for reading Dante than the study of Church History, and, on the other hand, there is nothing which sheds on Church History a more fascinating light than the *Divine Comedy*. In its cantos the principal figures with which the students in a Church History class must be making acquaintance appear in poetical illumination—Constantine, Justinian, Charlemagne, Frederick I, Frederick II, Gregory the Great, Innocent III, Boniface VIII, Benedict of Nursia, St. Bernard, St. Domenic, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, Anselm, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas and many more. Although Dante may be called the herald of the Renaissance, his is still more truly the mind in which the Middle Ages are summed up; indeed, the entire history of Christendom, in both its beliefs and practices, down to his time, is reflected in the magic mirror of his genius.

---

America is deeply interested in Japan. *The International Review of Missions* prints an article on "Recent movements in Japaneses Thought," by Prof. Masumi Hino. He gives us a view of the situation as follows:

The individual has come to the front more than the State in comparison of values; feeling is more highly estimated than either intellect or will. Thus at last the feeling of pleasure and pain in the widest sense has come to be regarded as the supreme court where life's deepest issues are to be judged and evaluated, and whence the sense of value itself and significance of this life and of society are to be derived, for it is, after all, the sentiment



man and woman susceptible to joy and sorrow who can appreciate worth of any kind whatever.

Such is the psychology of a large majority of Japanese young people at present, so far as I can judge. However true the above argument may be, judgment based on feeling alone is the most fleeting phenomenon in our mental processes, and highly susceptible to change. "Love is blind." In like manner all emotions are to a large extent blind. No universal standard or criterion can be found among the various forms of emotion which would be definite and constant enough to guide one's decision at a critical moment. The sense of duty has been weakened to a marked degree among young people. Righteousness and honesty do not seem at present to evoke reverential feelings from the hearts of this generation. The foundation of ethics is shaken. Moral principles have been by some pronounced as rules invented by ancient people with a view to promote their interest or the interest of their own State.

This critical momentum, in which the young people of Japan are deeply immersed, has been observed by some of the leading public men with grave apprehension. Men of insight and love of country are seriously considering the problem with a desire to save Japan from the moral and spiritual peril that seems to be impending. A man like Tokonami, former Vice-minister of Home Affairs, openly declared that Japan could only be saved from the moral catastrophe if ministers of various religions co-operated with more activity than has hitherto been the case. He finally persuaded Mr. Hara, for Minister of Home Affairs, to summon representatives of Buddhism, Shinto and Christianity to hold a meeting in the capital on the 25th of February, 1912. Japanese people realize now the urgent need of religion far more deeply than they did at the end of the nineteenth century. The whole country is open to various modes of Christian instruction. Preaching now wins amazingly quick response. The number of Protestants has more than doubled in the past fifteen years. Japan now furnishes a fruitful soil, and



the laborers are indeed scarce. We must work hard and no doubt the harvest will be great.

---

An article on "The National Spirit and the Indian Church" in the same review by Herbert Anderson, concludes as follows:

In conclusion, how helpful is the thought that Christ, the head of the Church, is the perfecter of His own great purposes in and for His Church. For what reason He has permitted this long delay and why the chariot wheels of reunion are dragging so heavily on the sands of the western world, we know not. But this we surely know, that He desires His Church in India to be a visible organization and fellowship, with faith as its foundation and holiness of life as its shining characteristic. The challenge of the hour to missions is to foster the growth of unity in the Indian Church, everywhere to walk in the spirit of love and mutual confidence, and to cultivate an even deeper faith and joyous hope in Him and in one another. And when the Indian Church is united, strong to suffer, patient to endure, and powerful to work, no greater glory could missions desire than that to them Christ had given some humble part in accomplishing this service for Him.

"Oriental Students in North America" are described in the same review by Charles Dubois Hurrey. We quote something pertaining to their "Dangers."

The dangers which confront the foreign student are not less numerous than the opportunities. Being an object of curiosity in many institutions he must constantly battle against subtle pride or conceit which result from receiving too much attention; if accompanied by others of his nationality he is in danger of becoming clannish and of lapsing into the use of his native language, manners and customs to the exclusion of other interesting companions. To form a snap judgment or hasty opinion based on superficial observation is one of the real dangers of the foreign student; upon seeing one hypocritical Christian he is tempted to discount the sufficiency of Christ. Not many students from abroad suffer a physi-

cal or moral breakdown, but the possibility of such disaster is greater than with others, because they do not readily participate in athletic games. They have to study very hard and they are far removed from home restraints; hence they must constantly be on their guard against the formation of destructive habits practiced by thoughtless American youth. Another real danger is the gaining of a mass of book knowledge and theories but little if any practical experience in the application of such knowledge; upon returning home, therefore, they discover that they are of little use in the old surroundings, and their condition is doubly precarious if they have lost sympathy with the vital needs of their people. Many a returned student has failed because he desired an easy job and all the comforts and luxuries which he enjoyed in America. As might be expected, a few foreign students squander their time and money, and occasionally one who left home a professing Christian denies the faith, becomes cynical and, chiefly on account of the inconsistency and neglect of nominal Christian people, degenerates into an intellectually trained enemy of the cause of Christ.

*Gettysburg, Pa.*



## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

## ARTICLE VIII.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

*Christian Nurture.* By Horace Bushnell. New and Revised Edition. Biographical Sketch by Prof. Williston Walker, and Revision by Prof. Luther A. Weigle, both of Yale University. Cloth. Pp. xxx. 351. Price \$1.50 net.

The first edition of *Christian Nurture* appeared about seventy years ago. It was republished in enlarged form several times later. The standard edition was copyrighted in 1888, which is substantially reproduced in the present edition. The revision consists in the omission of a few brief passages of a controversial nature. An analytical table of Contents covering fourteen pages, is new, and useful in the absence of an index. It must have been a congenial task for Dr. Weigle, reared in a Lutheran parsonage and himself a Lutheran minister, to edit this book. And it is not accidental that he should have been chosen as the Horace Bushnell Professor of Christian Nurture in Yale University, for his training in the teachings and traditions of the Lutheran Church and his own writings fitted him for the place of which he will, no doubt, prove himself worthy.

*Christian Nurture* was an era-making book and did much to correct the false views of family religion which had been fostered by the revivalism rampant in Bushnell's day. Apart from its genesis, *Christian Nurture* was and will remain a most useful book. It is not merely negative in combatting error but positively constructive. Its arguments for infant baptism and the training of children are fresh and powerful, because they are so closely related to life, and in accord with reason and the Bible.

We strongly urge our pastors to secure this book for their own use and to commend it to their people. There is in it the inspiration of dozens of sermons for the pastor. Dr. Bushnell has the right philosophy of family life. The persistent presentation of the subject-matter of this volume will result in an almost ideal congregation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

## THE METHODIST CONCERN. NEW YORK.

*James Monroe Buckley.* By George Preston Mains.  
Cloth. Pp. 305. Price \$1.50.

Dr. Mains has rendered a useful service, not only to the Methodist but to all churches, by preparing a sympathetic biography of one of the leading preachers and journalists of America during the last generation. From 1880 to 1912 as editor of *The Christian Advocate*, the oldest weekly publication of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he exercised a most potent influence in the affairs of his Church. For many years he was the leading figure at the meetings of the great General Conference. As a preacher and debater he has had few equals. He has been a prolific and racy writer. In the promotion of benevolent enterprises, and in advocacy of truth and right, Dr. Buckley has been a recognized power.

Dr. Buckley comes from good English stock. His father came to America in 1827 and was married to a very remarkable woman, Abby Lonsdale, in 1835. Dr. Buckley was born in 1836 and is still in good health at eighty. In youth he was handicapped by a weak constitution, and a poor health record in the family. By heroic persistence he overcame his physical weakness and accomplished a prodigious amount of work.

We commend his biography especially to students and young ministers for its stimulating power. The latter may learn much from the experience of this prince of preachers, not simply as to his methods but also as to the content of his preaching which was always in harmony with the Scriptures and the accepted faith of the Church.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Cyclopedia of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals* (1917 Edition). By Deets Pickett, Editor.  
Cloth. 4½ x 8¼. Pp. 406. Price by mail 55 cents.

This is a pocket cyclopaedia of the subjects mentioned in the title, carefully collated by the competent editor and his staff. Its range is wide, covering all phases of the subjects, reaching out to all lands and giving most valuable information in brief compass. The index contains about four hundred references to the contents of the book. Every reader of the QUARTERLY should secure a copy.

J. A. SINGMASTER.



*A Prophet of the Spirit: A Sketch of the Character and Work of Jeremiah.* By Lindsay B. Longacre, Professor of Old Testament Literature and Religion, Iliff School of Theology. Denver, Colo. 12mo. Pp. 128. 75 cents.

Although Jeremiah is the prophet of the spiritual life and of individual religion and the most popular prophet with the Jews, he has not been the best-known of the prophets to readers of the English Bible. Interpretations such as this one, however, are doing much to bring "the weeping prophet" back to his place of supremacy. Both the prophet and his message have a special meaning for Lutherans, and a new appreciation of Jeremiah would be a worthy fruit of our quadricentennial celebration of the Reformation.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

*Bring Him to Me; or The Sufficient Remedy.* By Charles Nelson Pace. 16mo. Cloth. 72 pages. Price 50 cents net.

The argument in this booklet is based on the incident of the healing of the lunatic boy at the foot of the mount of transfiguration. It of course gets its title from the same story, from the words of Jesus to the father, "Bring him unto me." In the opening chapter reference is made to Raphael's picture of the Transfiguration found in the Vatican at Rome. The author then uses the lunatic child as a type of "the bad man" of to-day, the man possessed by the devil of sin, overcome by its power, "The measure of any religion is what it can do with a bad man. . . . The bad man is here. He is the problem of the police, of our courts, of all society. . . . Let us gather around him and study his case. It is our problem. He has been brought to our attention and consideration. Like those disciples of old in the group at the base of the mountain, we are alone with the task. How can we help him? What can we do?"

Various agencies are then represented as proposing a remedy, such as "The Arm of the Law," "Corrective Surgery," "Social Efficiency," "Eugenics and Euthenics." All of these fail, as a matter of course, just as the disciples failed with the poor afflicted child. Then comes the Church with its message of hope and salvation, and points the sinner to Him who says, "Bring him to me," and who alone is "mighty to save." It is a wholesome and help-

ful discussion of the problem, and deserves wide reading in these days when so many are disposed to look to man-made remedies for sin and for the ills of society, instead of to the gospel plan of salvation provided by God Himself.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE MACMILLAN CO. NEW YORK.

*Religion in a World at War.* By George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass. Cloth. Pp. 103. Price \$1.00.

Dr. Hodges has the happy faculty of expressing great thoughts in simple language. He shows the true position of the Church in the present war. The topics discussed are: "In the Storm of War," "Easter in a World at War," "Memorial Day in a World at War," "All Saints' Day in a World at War," "God and the World's Pain," "Pain and the World's Progress," "The Everlasting Vitality of the Christian Religion." These topics are based on Scripture texts and their discussion is very practical. The author sensibly recognizes the justification of some wars and sees in the present world conflict the hand of God, who will overrule its horrors for the advancement of His kingdom.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Saint Paul the Hero.* By Rufus M. Jones, Author of "The Inner Life," etc. 12mo. Pp. 172. Price \$1.00.

Doctor Jones has put into form and language suited to boys and girls in their teens the life of the Apostle Paul. He follows the Biblical narrative closely and finds in the wonderful narrative itself sufficient material without adding imaginary incidents or details. The book should be used not only by children but by teachers who need continuous and interesting presentation of the life of Saint Paul. There are a number of beautiful illustrations and two maps.

E. S. L.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

*The Singing Weaver and Other Stories.* By Julius and Margaret Seebach. Cloth, 7½ x 5 inches. Pp. 288. Price \$1.00.

There are eight stories in this volume; "Hero Tales of the Reformation," they are called in a sub-title. They



are all very interesting and splendidly told, and they are all true stories, or at least based on actual historical incidents. There is only enough of fiction and invention to round out the pictures and make them complete. They are charminng pictures, all of them, and will prove a distinct and valuable addition to the literature of this quadricentennial year.

In a Reformation address before the recent General Synod in Chicago, Dr. L. C. Manges, of Harrisburg, spoke of "The Voices in the Chorus." By these "Voices" he meant the multitude of unnamed and unknown preachers and teachers of the truth by whom the Reformation was spread abroad through Germany, and even into other lands, and without whose faithful and tireless labors the great work of Luther and the other leaders in the Reformation must have been largely in vain.

This book of stories is intended to perform a similar service for the many faithful men and women, and even children, who in more humble stations and ways also helped on the good work. As the authors say in the "Foreword": "Much of the best fighting in that great struggle for faith and freedom, which we call the Reformation, was done by those who in war would be known as 'non-combatants'—the children, the women, the aged men—who in their homes, on the streets, in prison or at the stake, witnessed for the pure gospel truth. The tales that follow are true stories of such helpers of the Reformation, mostly feeble and obscure, but good and valiant heroes nevertheless; of whom we seldom hear, but whose names, and many such, the dear Lord has written in His book of remembrance."

The volume has a beautiful and artistic illuminated title page by Jessie Gillespie. The printing is of high grade, and the binding permits the book to open fully at any page without strain. It ought to be in every Sunday School library, and we could hardly imagine a more suitable Christmas gift for boys and girls.

The volume is dedicated to John A. Himes, Litt.D., for many years professor of English in Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, Pa., the father of Mrs. Seebach and the honored teacher of both her and her husband when students in the college.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

*A Booklet of Teaching Drills for Sunday School and Home.* A Compilation by H. C. Haithcox, D.D. 16mo. Bound in paper. Pp. 27. Price 10 cents net per single copy. Per dozen 75 cents.

The material in this booklet is arranged in the form of questions and answers. It is divided into 34 lessons or "drills." It is intended, so the preface says, especially for the use of parents in the home, or for teachers in the Sunday School. It seems to be admirably adapted to this purpose. It strikes us that it might also be found very helpful to pastors for use in a Junior Catechism class. The lessons are short, but with additional free questions and explanations, and a thorough drill so as to fix the answers in the minds of the pupils, it would be easy to spend half an hour or more on each lesson. It covers the fundamentals in Christian faith and worship and life in a very simple and helpful way. Its use would be a fine preparation for the Small Catechism of Luther, our standard text-book for use in the instruction of the young. One of the blank pages in front is given up to a neat Baptism Certificate, and a like page at the end to a Confirmation Certificate.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN. ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*The Gracious Water of Life.* Words of Counsel to the Parents of Newly Baptized Children. By Rev. Ira O. Nothstein, A.M. 16mo. Pp. 48. Price in art cover 25 cents net; in silk cloth 50 cents net.

*A Cradle Roll Manual for Sunday Schools.* By Rev. C. A. Lund. 12mo. Pp. 63. Price in art cover 35 cents net; in ooze sheep 75 cents net.

Both these attractive booklets have to do with the children. The first one, as indicated in the title, deals with the child's baptism, and is intended especially to instruct and quicken the parents in the discharge of their duties towards their children who have been "presented to God in Holy Baptism." It is beautifully illustrated, and is provided with blank forms for a Certificate of Baptism, and also "Cradle Roll Certificate." It has a special page also for the "Baby's Picture." It is thus not only a suit-



able manual to be placed in the hands of parents at the time of the baptism of their children, but when the proper blanks are filled it will become a suggestive and treasured souvenir to be preserved by the child in after years.

The second booklet is intended for the instruction and guidance of those who have charge of the "Cradle Roll," which is now a prominent feature of nearly all progressive Sunday Schools. It deals with such topics as the purpose of the Cradle Roll, the baptism of the children, the Cradle Roll Superintendent, the securing of members, the keeping of the records, the many things that may be done to keep up the interest of the parents and eventually to bring the growing child into the Sunday School and to keep it there. It is also beautifully illustrated with pictures relating to child life, and the child's relation to the Church and to Christ.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO.

*"He Whom Thou Lovest is Sick."* Admonition and Comfort for the Sick and Suffering. Compiled by Edward Staudermann, Ev. Luth. Pastor. 16mo. Pp. 80. Flexible cloth. Price 35 cents, postpaid.

As indicated by the title this little manual is intended to carry instruction, comfort and help to the chamber of sickness and affliction. It may be used by pastors in their visits to the afflicted. It seems to be especially adapted to be left in the hands of the sick for use in their private devotions, and meditation. It is made up of very brief selections of suitable Scriptural passages, usually only one or two verses, each being followed by a few lines from some familiar hymn or other sacred verse. These are arranged under suitable topics, and each topic closes with an appropriate prayer.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE S. S. SCRANTON COMPANY. HARTFORD, CONN.

*A History of the Reformation.* By Elias B. Sanford, D.D. 8vo. Pp. xiii + 287. Price \$1.50 net.

Dr. Sanford, the author of this volume, is "Honorary Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." This fact has probably had much to do with the preparation of the volume itself. It brought

him into close touch with the several leading Protestant denominations and naturally stimulated the desire to trace their development from a common source, and their inner spiritual connection. It is in this spirit that the volume is written, and he closes with this devout expression of his faith and hope: "Above the tumult of strifes that so often, in centuries past, have divided the Church, of which Christ is the Head, may we not hope and believe that this Twentieth Century of the Christian era shall rejoice in the answer to our Savior's prayer as He entered the path that led through Gethsemane to the Cross—and then to the morning of the Resurrection and the Day of Pentecost—'that they may all be one; even as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me.'"

There is no pretense of great learning or originality in this history of the Reformation. The author has not gone back to the original sources, neither does he claim to have made any important additions to our knowledge of either the Reformers or of their work. But he has made excellent use of the available materials and has given us an interesting and helpful presentation of the main facts. His style is clear and convincing. His material is well organized and his facts are well arranged. He shows a fine sense of proportion, a well balanced judgment, and a clear insight, all of which are most essential to the true historian.

The discussion is divided into two parts. Part I deals with the Forerunners of the Reformation, to whom five chapters are devoted, and with Luther and the Reformation in Germany, which subject occupies the remaining eleven chapters of this part. Part II, which consists of ten chapters, deals with the Reformation in England, Scotland, Switzerland, France, and the Netherlands.

We can heartily recommend this volume to those who want a brief and reliable history of the whole Reformation movement either for their own reading or to place in the hands of a friend. We know of nothing better.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY.

*"The New Archeological Discoveries: And their Bearing Upon the New Testament and Upon the Life and Times of the Primitive Church,"* by Camden M. Curnburn, D.D., Litt.D., James M. Thoburn Chair of Eng-



lish Bible and Philosophy of Religion, Allegheny College; Honorary Secretary for Pennsylvania and Member of the General Executive Committee (American Branch) of the Egypt Exploration Fund, etc., etc. Introduction by Edouard Naville, D.C.L., LL.D., Foreign Associate of the Institute de France; Professor of Archeology in the University of Geneva, Switzerland. 8vo. Cloth, illustrated. Price \$3.00 net; by mail \$3.16. Funk & Wagnalls Company, Publishers, New York.

No one discovery in a thousand years has meant so much for Biblical scholarship as that of Grenfell and Hunt when, in 1897, they excavated for the Egypt Exploration Fund the now famous site Behnesa, the ancient Oxyrhynchus, situated in the Nile valley some 120 miles south of Cairo, and discovered great quantities of Greek papyri. These papyri were shipped to London literally by the ton. The first official report of them lists some 1300 documents. The first volume contained 158 texts, dating from 200 B. C. to 600 A. D., and comprising new MSS. with new and important readings in a large number of Greek classics. A large number were private letters. A considerable number were Bible texts, dating a hundred years earlier than any known texts of the New Testament, some "sayings of our Lord," with some Christian letters and certificates. Similar finds, on a much smaller scale, had been made in Egypt since 1877. Two years before this date Dr. Adolf Deissmann had made his great discovery that these papyri were written in the very language of the New Testament and drawn his inference that New Testament Greek could not any longer be regarded as an esoteric language, that the gospels were "people's books," written in the dialect of the middle classes in the vernacular of the home and the shop, the *κοινή* of the day. This dialect had spread throughout a considerable part of Egypt, as the papyri testify.

In 1909 the late Dr. Gregory, of Leipzig, catalogued the MSS. of the New Testament in existence and listed some 35 or 40 fragments, 16 or 17 of which had been recovered within twenty years. Kenyon and Milligan (1913) add eight more to this list. Prof. Coburn adds about a dozen more. These, together with the famous Free MSS. recovered in 1916, constitute the apparatus for the new study of our New Testament which has revolutionized our study of that book. These papyri show that the New

Testament was not the sacred book of a chosen people, not a book written for the priests or the learned, but a people's book, in the people's language. The language in which it was written was the language in which the Gospel was preached, that popular Greek dialect which after the conquest of Alexander had spread over West Asia and particularly Egypt where it became the idiomatic tongue of common speech.

The clue to New Testament interpretation, therefore, is idiomatic speech. Of the 5,000 words in the Greek New Testament, 3,000 are found in the classic Attic writers, but the remainder are almost all taken from the Koine or popular language of the first century. This study shows that Paul did not forge new words for his teaching, or invent new expressions; he used those with which his contemporaries were familiar, giving them a Christian sense; for instance, the titles by which the emperor was addressed are the words applied to God Himself, or to Jesus Christ. Following Deissmann, Prof. Coburn shows in a very interesting way, that the title "Lord" given to Jesus was used in a sense that could not be misunderstood. Since the title "Lord" could only be used after Caesar had been acknowledged as God, and implied, therefore, that the emperor had been deified, the term *Kύριος Ἰησοῦς* (Lord Jesus) was a distinct ascription of deity to Christ.

It has been the author's purpose to make his work a "corpus" of all the more fascinating facts and all the interesting and beautiful sayings that have come down to us from these opulent centuries. Prof. Coburn draws some interesting parallels between ancient and modern life. As if to prove that there is nothing new under the sun he shows how the suffragists won woman's rights B. C. 425; how the third century millionaires evaded inheritance taxes; the price of pork and beans under imperial Rome; how, even in Cleopatra's time, the domestics insisted upon their "days off"; shorthand and rhetoric were popular studies in the Apostolic era; even "Preparedness" was a first century slogan.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK.

*What the World Owes Luther.* By Junius B. Remensnyder, D.D., LL.D.

Dr. Remensnyder has written in less than a hundred pages a fine appreciation of Luther, which the busy man



will welcome not simply for its brevity but also for its comprehensiveness and vividness. The great hero is introduced to the reader in a sketch of his early years and struggles, from which he emerges the many-sided man, whom history recognizes as the creator of a distinct era. The unique personality of Luther is faithfully portrayed in the author's own words and in striking quotations from many illustrious admirers. The indebtedness of the present age to Luther for deliverance from errors and for the genesis of modern life is convincingly presented. The book is a fine specimen of the printer's and binder's art at a nominal price.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Liturgy and Agenda* (of the Missouri Synod). Pp. 494.

Octavo of 6 by 9. American Morocco, flexible, gilt over red-stained edges, overlapping divinity circuit covers. Price \$4.00, postpaid.

This "Liturgy and Agenda" has been matured by the English Synod of Missouri, once an independent body within the Synodical Conference, now a district of the Missouri Synod.

We can best give an impression of the volume by acquainting the reader with the forms contained therein.

There are, first, two forms for the morning service. The music for the parts to be sung, (embracing the Nicene and the Apostles' Creed) is found in an appendix to the book. The first form is that of the Common Service. The second belongs to an altogether different order of liturgies. Here confession and absolution comes *after* the sermon, absolution in the declarative form of the "Confessional or Preparatory Service, ("in the stead and by command of my Lord Jesus Christ I forgive you all your sins.") The Communion Service is given in connection with the first form, which is throughout like that of the Common Service, except that the form of distribution reads: "This is the *true* Body," etc. This form (der *wahre* Leib) came into use in Germany as a protest against the *Agenda* of the Prussian Union. It is observed everywhere among the German Lutherans of our country, the Germans of the General Synod included. The Common Service in English has here simply followed Luther (*hoc est corpus meum*).

The forms for Evening Service and Matins are those

of the Common Service. The form for the "Confessional or Preparatory Service" is exceptionally brief and with regard to impressiveness cannot be compared with the same form in the Common Service.

The volume is very rich in prayers for many purposes. There are "Special Intercessions and Thanksgivings": for women after childbirth, for the churching of women, for catechumens, communicants, persons betrothed, for the sick; prayers also at the announcement of a death, during a vacancy in a church, in time of dearth and famine, in time of unseasonable weather, of pestilence, of great disaster, in times of insurrection and tumult, in time of war, and of peace restored. Among the prayers at festivals and special occasions we mention some that strike us as specially new and practical: at the festival of church dedication, for parochial schools, a minister's jubilee, a teacher's jubilee, jubilee of a congregation, anniversary of confirmation, of young people's society, ladies' aid society, charities, home-finding societies, home for the aged, hospital, graduation of nurses, home for the feeble-minded.

In the Agenda is a form for Baptism *without sponsors*, for the reception of converts, for announcement of excommunication and restoration. We find a prayer for the dedication of a parsonage, of a parish house, even of a dwelling house.

There are in the liturgical part of the book 28 brief prayers for evening services and other occasions, with the diversity of objects indicated by superscriptions: for success of the Word, repentance and improvement, help to overcome the world, for a holy life, and so forth. These prayers are beautiful in form and thought and with respect to length very practical for the purpose mentioned. The English is throughout fluent and too long sentences have been avoided. The Missouri Synod is to be congratulated on this fine guide for its English services.

J. L. NEVE.

*Second Volume of Dr. Walther's Letters* ("Briefe von C. F. W. Walther.") By L. Fuerbringer. Pp. 236. Price \$1.00 postpaid.

We reviewed the first volume of these letters in the American Lutheran Survey. The Missouri Synod of today bears the stamp of Walther. This volume shows, more than the first, Walther's influence upon his synod. The letters of special interest for the historian are those



referring to or discussing the Buffalo Synod, the colloquy with the Iowa Synod. Walther also expresses himself on the question of loaning money on interest, to which he was opposed, and he gives advice on numerous questions of discipline. He expresses himself as opposed to a pledge with regard to temperance, for the reason that it would be equal to a declaration that the Baptismal vow and the power given through Baptism are of less value than the pledge. This volume contains very hard judgments against the leaders of the German Iowa Synod. Something remarkable about Walther is the intense cordiality in writing to his friends. This is one secret of his influence over men.

J. L. NEVE.

JOINT LUTHERAN COMMITTEE ON CELEBRATION OF THE  
QUADRICENTENNIAL OF THE REFORMATION. PHILA., PA.

*Protest and Progress in the XVIth Century.* By Carolus P. Harry, Reading, Pa. Cloth. Pp. 162.

This is in every way an excellent, practical summary of the Reformation story. It was prepared particularly for groups of Sunday School teachers, mission study-classes and the like; and it serves this purpose admirably. At the close of each chapter is a series of questions covering its contents. The book is well printed and finely illustrated. The title is not quite definite enough. Moreover the title should always be printed on the back of the cover, so that it will appear when the book stands on the shelf.

We commend Mr. Harry's book to pastor and people.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

AUGSBURG PUBLICATION HOUSE. MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

*The Spirit of American Lutheranism and Other Essays.*

By Charles O. Solberg, D.D., of the Department of Religion, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. Cloth. Pp. 218. Price \$1.00 net.

These essays by Professor Solberg show a fine appreciation of the history, genius and future of the Lutheran Church in America. They deal with the doctrines and practical affairs of the Church, such as the doctrine of the Word, of the Lord's Supper and of the Confessions, as well as of Luther's Relation to Modern Theological

Thought, of the Lutheran Type of Preaching, of the Language Situation and of Religious Education.

The impression made on the reader is that if the Lutheran Church be true to its best traditions and faithful to its great opportunities, it will render a vast service to the present disturbed age of the world, and continue to justify its existence as a part of the Church of the living Christ.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO. OBERLIN, OHIO.

*Story of My Life and Work.* By G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A. Cloth. Pp. xvi 459. Price \$2.00 postpaid.

This autobiography of Dr. Wright is of more than ordinary interest. It is a well told story by a modest and most distinguished scholar, who has spent sixty years in the active service of the Church and her schools. He was born at Whitehall, N. Y., Jan. 22, 1838, and is hale in his eightieth year. The reminiscences of his childhood and youth are most charming. His struggles for an education were somewhat arduous and their recital would be wholesome reading for ambitious young men. He has been an extensive traveler, visiting every part of the northern hemisphere, chiefly in the interest of science. He has made a profound study of glacial phenomena, and is the leading living authority on that subject. He has written numerous volumes and many articles for various scientific and religious magazines, especially for the *Bibliotheca Sacra* with which he has been associated for forty years and of which he has been the editor for thirty.

His faith is that of a conservative, orthodox Christian, and he has always been a champion of Christianity. His studies in the Book and in Nature have confirmed his belief in the existence and goodness of God. The concluding chapter of the autobiography is headed "My Creed," in which he summarizes his views, which I venture to condense still further. He believes that he exists as a rational, sentient being, under obligation to shape his conduct with reference "to the highest good of being." The primal self-existent, eternal reality "is spiritual and personal, rather than material and impersonal." God the Creator has established a system of secondary causes, material and spiritual. "The doctrine of Monism and of the immanence of God as set forth by its extreme advo-



cates overlooks the plainest facts of existence." In the beginning God created the elements out of which have evolved, under his direction, the heavens and the earth. How these things were done is a mystery of science and of theology. Life came into the world as a new creation, and that there was an orderly progress from lower to higher forms. There is no proof that this progress has been due wholly to the inherent forces of nature. "Whatever may be true about some organic connection between man and some unknown species of anthropoid ape, man with his present physical and spiritual characteristics appeared suddenly on the earth, at no very distant period, as geologists count time." The Glacial epoch, which extended down to historical times, has had a most marked influence on nature and man, and confirms the story of the flood and of dispersion of the human race. Man, with all his splendid reasoning powers, needs a revelation from God for his guidance and satisfaction. This revelation God has given in the Bible. Care must be exercised in the interpretation of miracles, "lest we burden ourselves with unnecessary and harmful incongruities." The New Testament is the genuine and authoritative record "of the facts concerning Christ's life and the doctrines which are logically connected with that life." The truths of Christianity and the unity of the Church are best promoted by adhering to the early creeds, especially the Nicene. As God raised up "judges in Israel" so he will again raise up leaders to defend the old faith. In due time scientists and theologians will come to an agreement as to "well-established truths pertaining to both the material and spiritual world."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO, ILL.

*Thirty-five Years of Luther Research.* By J. M. Reu, D.D., Professor of Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Ia. Twenty-seven illustrations. Cloth. Price \$1.00 net.

These essays by Dr. Reu give a comprehensive survey of the vast work done in the field of Luther research since 1883. We have here not a mere bibliography, but a fine analysis of Luther literature treating of the various periods of the Reformer's life and teachings. No one who wishes to study Luther seriously and to write about him can afford to ignore this book. Dr. Reu's learned investigations enhance rather than dim the lustre of the

great Reformer. Luther has been tried in the furnace of criticism and comes out like the gold that has passed through the refiner's fire. After four centuries he is still the modern man, whom the world will not forget.

We regret to have to say that Dr. Reu's translators have not done justice to the original. While the English is generally readable and fair, it sometimes fails to convey a clear meaning. To illustrate: here is a passage taken at random. "One cannot well differentiate between Luther's residence on the Wartburg and his attitude towards the Scriptures. Not, indeed, because Luther here learned to look upon the Scriptures in a new relation, so that not until now they become for him the only source of religious knowledge. This proposition already crumbles into dust in view of the sources that were generally available prior to 1883, and to maintain it now is to become guilty of an historical falsification for the sake of one's construction. Undritz already wrote a splendid article," &c. This is simply German "tumbled over" into English, showing a painful lack of a clear knowledge of the significance of words and of the art of composition.

We are not hypercritical; and it is only for the sake of the fine work that is being done in German by our brethren, especially in the West, that we call attention to the inadequate translations in which it too often is doomed to appear. Would it not be well for translators, who have been reared in a German or Scandinavian atmosphere, to submit their translations to the revision of a competent English-American scholar?

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

*The Pope's Catechism, or The Teachings of Roman Catholicism Made Plain for Protestants.* By Rev. J. Sheatsley. Cloth. Pp. 188. Price 75 cents postpaid.

This book will be welcomed by all our readers who desire to have a simple statement of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. The catechism from which the author quotes is known as "Deharhe's Large Catechism, Translated by a Father of the Society of Jesus of the Province of Missouri, from the German Edition prepared for the United States, with the approval and co-operation of the author and approved by His Grace, the Most Rev. Archbishop of St. Louis."

Here will be found the same teaching which called for the Reformation and which Luther denounced 400 years



ago. The primacy and the infallibility of the Pope are asserted, and the doctrine of indulgences is boldly taught. To the question "From what source do indulgences draw their power and efficacy?" the answer is given, "From the treasury of the abundant merits of Jesus Christ and of the saints." "Tradition" is put on a par with the Scriptures. "A Christian must believe all that God has revealed and the Catholic Church teaches, whether it is contained in Holy Scripture or not." It is taught that Christ instituted seven sacraments. In the sacrament of Penance the sinner may obtain remission of "the temporal punishment due to his sins." He, however, should even exceed the penance assigned by the Confessor for "we should try to satisfy the Divine Justice by other voluntary works of penance, and by patience in our sufferings." Transubstantiation is plainly taught; and the merit of good works done in a state of grace, it is said, reaches even to "eternal salvation." Prayers to Saints and the angels, and for the dead are commanded.

To those who have believed that the Roman Catholic Church to-day is not that of the Middle Ages, the present volume will be a revelation. It ought to find a place in every minister's library and in that of all intelligent laymen.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE ABINGDON PRESS. 150 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY.

*Religious Education and Democracy.* By Benjamin S. Winchester. 8vo. Pp. 293. Cloth binding. Price \$1.50 net.

Dr. Winchester, the author of this fine volume, is a professor in the Department of Religious Education in the Yale University School of Religion. He is also Chairman of the Commission on Religious Education of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. It was in the latter capacity, as he tells us in the preface, that he prepared for his Commission a "Survey of Week-day Religious Education." His book is a further revision and development of this work. It consists of two parts, the first part being historical and theoretical, the second part practical.

The motive which prompted the author in the preparation of his book may be inferred from the opening paragraph of the Preface: "The present world situation compels a serious re-examination of the foundations of de-

mocracy. Especially does it necessitate a consideration of educational processes and materials. In the haste to achieve efficiency may it not be that some indispensable values have been sacrificed? The words of Jesus sound again with a new emphasis: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" The same applies to a nation as well as to the individual. "Has democracy failed?" men are asking to-day. Has Christianity failed? These have not failed, but, as one recent writer has said, they have been found difficult and have not yet been fairly tried."

The author's conception of democracy, and of its relation to and dependence on religion, is very well set forth in another paragraph from Chapter XII of the first part, on "The Community Task of the Churches," which we also quote. "A world crisis is upon us, in which the interests of all humanity are involved. These interests are summed up in the word democracy, and democracy is the modern expression of the spirit of Jesus. The purpose of Jesus was to secure for all men the fullness of life; life for the individual in which his consciousness of God should be complete, his access to God immediate, his attitude toward God filial, his communion with God unbroken; and a common life pervaded by the sense of interdependence and brotherhood. The ideal of democracy is self-realization through self-sacrifice, the finding of the individual self through its submergence in the larger social self. Democracy involves the harmonizing of antagonistic forces within the individual to seek selfish advantage at the expense of his fellows, and the higher impulses which urge him to seek the common good. Democracy is a resultant of forces essentially religious and spiritual; it is the product of Christian faith."

His estimate of the present world-situation as to religious education is summarized thus: "In Germany religious education lags far behind the rest of education. In France religious education is supplied by the Roman Catholic Church, is unco-ordinate with the state system of education, is undemocratic in spirit, while the state system of moral education is bereft of its religious sanctions. The result is artificiality in moral instruction, superficiality and formalism in religion, and mutual distrust between Church and State. In England, the connection between Church and State has greatly retarded the progress of education in general, and recent development of state education has been attended by bitter controversy between the religious forces.



"In the United States, where democracy and education both had their beginnings in the Puritan commonwealth, the Protestant churches have relinquished entirely all connection with the state system of popular education. In both State and Church the *rights* of the individual have been emphasized out of all proportion to his *duties* to society. One result of this emphasis has been a serious weakening of Protestant influence and ineffectiveness of religious instruction. To-day, in the United States, less time is devoted to religious instruction provided by Protestants than is allotted to such instruction in any other first-class civilized country in the world."

We take the space for one more quotation embodying the author's appeal to the Protestant churches of America to measure up to the opportunity and responsibility which the present world crisis is pressing upon them.

"The spirit of democracy is astir in the world as never before. Ancient limitations and restraints are being cast aside, dynasties and autocracies overthrown. The way is opening for a new world in which social justice and co-operation and brotherhood shall take the place of individualism and self-seeking and exploitation. But the new world will demand a new spirit, the spirit of self-control, idealism, responsibility, and service. It is this new power which society must somehow develop through religion and education working hand in hand.

"The Protestant churches of America must not fail the cause of democracy in this hour of the world's history. Upon them rests, primarily, as we have seen, the responsibility for taking the initiative in this great task. The task is difficult, because it is so nearly new. But the churches will not hesitate on this account. They will not be so unpatriotic as to ignore their country's need, nor so selfish as to think mainly of their own denominational up-building or of merely national prestige. It is an hour of supreme opportunity for the churches to render a world service."

These extracts will give the general standpoint and spirit of the author. Among the more important subjects discussed in the first part of the volume are the relation between compulsory education and religious freedom; the essentials of democracy; typical systems of state education, including those of Germany, France, and England; the American public school system in its relation to the churches and democracy, to which an entire chapter is devoted; the development of the work of the Sunday School in the Protestant churches; etc. A very

interesting chapter is the one in which are presented "Some Recent Experiments in Religious Education." These include what are known as the North Dakota plan, the Colorado plan, the Lakewood, Ohio, plan, and the Gary plan.

Part Two is devoted to "Suggested Plans and Programs of Week-day Religious Instruction." Here are outlined the complete curricula for religious instruction in Germany, France, England, Australia, and Canada. Chapter II gives the curricula and syllabi followed in North Dakota, in Colorado, and by the several denominations co-operating with the schools in Gary, Indiana. Another chapter deals with the Parochial school systems of several of the denominations, including the Lutherans. Another chapter is devoted to suggestions for community and church co-operation in the smaller towns, etc.

At the close of the volume there is a very full bibliography, classified according to the chapter headings, and also an excellent index. Altogether, this is a very valuable contribution to a study and solution of one of the most vital problems of the day. Democracy will be safe and a blessing only in the proportion in which it is based on a pure and high morality, and there can be and will be no such morality without the teaching and sanctions of religion. Hence the necessity of teaching religion which is the peculiar province of the churches, and in a democracy like ours can be done only by the churches.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Missionary Education in Home and School.* By Ralph E. Diffendorfer. 12mo. 407 pages Cloth. Price \$1.50 net.

This is a convincing and compelling book. No one should read it who does not want to become interested in missions and missionary work. It should be read by everyone who is interested in the subject, and who wishes to learn how more effectively to work to get others interested.

Two paragraphs from the book will give the author's attitude and aim. "The church's problem of missionary education is the development of the missionary life and spirit in every Christian at home and abroad. It means the recognition of the essential oneness of "Christian" and "missionary." Missionary education must see to it that being a Christian is identical with having Christ's breadth of sympathy, intellectual outlook, and social values." This is the last paragraph in the volume.



The author's method is indicated in another paragraph from the first chapter on "The Aims of Missionary Education." "Missionary education will, therefore, seek to reach the springs of action, the native social impulses and feelings, and to strengthen and direct them through use. It will endeavor to inculcate high and adequate missionary ideals as the goals of Christian living, and will train a growing generation to be loyal to a world-wide brotherhood. It will relate individuals and groups of the needs of the world in service, and will endeavor to produce a generation intelligently in touch with the principles, history, and present status of the kingdom of God and to enlist every Christian as an active agent tirelessly working for the establishment of that kingdom."

As indicated by the title of the volume the chief sphere in which this missionary education is to be carried forward is the home and the school, and by the school is here meant the Sunday School. It is by training the children and youth of the Church in missionary knowledge and in missionary activities that the whole Church is to be leavened with the missionary spirit.

The discussion is in two parts. In the first part are ten chapters covering about 250 pages. The general subject is "Principles," and the chapter headings are such as "The Significance and Cultivation of Friendliness," "The Awakening and Extension of Sympathy," "The Development of Helpfulness," "Learning How to Co-operate," "Stewardship and Generosity," etc. The second part comprises seven chapters and deals with "Special Method." The separate chapters discuss methods of work with different classes, as "Children under nine years of age," girls and boys from nine to twelve, from thirteen to sixteen, young people from fifteen to eighteen, and young men and young women from eighteen to twenty-four years of age. In each case many helpful suggestions are given, and also a list of books that will be especially illuminating.

We heartily recommend this book to all pastors, and to Sunday School superintendents and teachers, and especially to the leaders of mission classes whether in or outside of the Sunday School.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Other Side of the Hill and Home Again.* By F. W. Boreham. 12mo. Pp. 274. Cloth. Price \$1.25 net. This volume takes its title from one of twenty-eight



delightful essays which make up its contents. It is typical also of the general spirit of the entire volume. Each essay is in some sense an attempt to see "The Other Side of the Hill," that is to get a new outlook from which to see and to judge human life and experience. The result is very interesting and suggestive. The most commonplace people and experiences, and even things, are made to take on new aspects and to reveal new meanings, which the ordinary, conventional, looker-on would never have suspected.

The style is simple, informal, conversational. The author seems to take the reader by the hand, and to ramble on with him, apparently without any definite goal, wandering into the most unsuspected by-ways and turning up in the most unexpected places. It seems like a constant series of surprises to both the author and his reader. Yet, somehow, when the ramble is finished, the reader always comes to feel that his guide has had a very positive purpose in view from the very first step. That purpose was to reach and explore "The Other Side of the Hill"; to reveal some unsuspected phase of the question under discussion, and to teach some new lesson that the ordinary observer would likely have missed.

From the title-page we learn that Mr. Boreham, who by the way is evidently a pastor—Methodist, we suspect—in Melbourne, Australia, has previously published several other volumes of a similar character. At least this would seem to be indicated by the titles given: "Faces in the Fire," "Mushrooms on the Moor," "The Golden Milestone," "Mountains in the Mist," "The Luggage of Life," etc. We are sure that every one who reads one of these books will want to read more. Dr. Kelley, the gifted editor of *The Methodist Review*, says this of Boreham, all of which we have found eminently true: "A most suggestible person is this Tasmanian essayist. To him every event and object is suggestive; wherever his glance strikes it ricochets to something else. An expert driver of ideas by things is Boreham. An unspeakable treasure and joy is such a mind."

Just to give a taste of what is in store for those who buy and read this volume, we quote a short paragraph or two from the essay which gives title to it. "It is a fine thing to know what is on the other side of the hill. Who can read the fiery theological controversies of days gone by without wishing that each of the angry disputants had been able to peep over the brow of the ridge? Think of the language with which Luther and Calvin assailed each



other! Think even of the correspondence of Wesley and Toplady. Wesley, the greatest evangelical force that England has ever known, wrote of the author of "Rock of Ages," "Mr. Augustus Toplady I know very well; but I do not fight with chimney-sweeps. He is too dirty a writer for me to meddle with; I should only foul my fingers." Toplady was quite capable of repaying the founder of Methodism in his own coin. Wesley, he declared, was a hatcher of blasphemies; his forehead was impervious to a blush; he had perpetrated upon the public a known, a wilful, and a palpable lie! But it is too bad of me to drag these amenities of eighteenth-century controversy from the dust that has so long covered them. Let me bury them again at once; and let us remember Wesley only as the greatest spiritual force in the making of modern England, and let us remember Toplady only as the author of our favorite hymn.

"For after all, what do these angry sentences prove? They prove that, for a little season, neither Wesley nor Toplady was able to see what was on the other side of the hill. I never read a newspaper controversy, or listen to a heated debate, without feeling that. It is so obvious that each of the disputants is standing on his own side of the hill, shouting at his opponent over the ridge that separates them."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*With the Children*; in Lewis Carroll's Company. By William Valentine Kelley. 12mo. (5 x 7½ inches). Pages 139. Cloth binding. Price 75 cents net.

This book is evidently written by one whom little children love, as well as by one who loves little children. Whoever takes it up and begins to read will not want to lay it down until it has been finished. Then there will come the quick desire to go back and read it all over again, and to recommend it to every friend. At least this has been the experience of one reader. It is like a string of pearls, or a garden of roses, or a meadow of wild flowers, a constant succession of bright and beautiful facts and fancies, expressed in a style that is as pleasing and as attractive as the thoughts that it conveys. Reading it is like strolling with a delightful friend through a charming country-side where every rise and fall of the ground, and every turn of the road, opens up new vistas of beauty and delight which constantly lure to further advance.

It is easy to believe the author when he says that his



book "just wrote itself." Such a book could not have been written in any other way. It is as spontaneous as a fountain, and like the waters of a fountain it is ever fresh and sweet, and gives you the feeling that it is inexhaustible and that you want it to go on and on without stopping.

One is often disappointed in a book after reading the advertisement, because the fulfillment falls so far below the promise. It is not so with this book, and we can heartily endorse every word of the announcement by the publishers when they say that "in this little book will be found the wit, the wisdom, and the religion of childhood set forth in wise and winning fashion. Following in the company of Lewis Carroll, the author unfolds for all who have eyes to see, and ears to hear, and hearts to feel the surpassing beauty and worth of childhood years. It is a wonderfully luminous showing forth of the opportunities the child offers to the Home, the Church, and the World."

Lewis Carroll was the pen-name of Charles L. Dodgson, an English clergyman of the last century. As Charles L. Dodgson he was an Oxford "don," devoted to higher Mathematics and the author of many learned books on that subject. As Lewis Carroll he was the friend of little children, and the author of a series of popular books for children, "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland," "Through the Looking Glass," "Hunting the Shark," etc. which have given endless pleasure not only to children but to multitudes of grown-ups as well. It is easy to see therefore, why Dr. Kelley chose Lewis Carroll for his and our companion on this delightful stroll "With the Children." Dr. Kelley has also lived "a double life." To the world of scholarship he is known as a distinguished Methodist Doctor of Divinity, and for many years the learned editor of the *Methodist Review*, one of our most ponderous theological quarterlies. But to his intimate friends he is better known as a lover of children, greatly gifted with an understanding and sympathetic insight into the very innermost sanctuary of their childish thought and life. Through the medium of this booklet many others will come to know and enjoy this side of his life.

Opposite the title page is a very fine photograph presentation of the features of the author which will add much to the value of the little volume for the multitude of children and others who have known, and loved, and admired him.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.



*Scotty Kid*; the Life Story of "Brother Tommy." Told by "Li-ke-ke." Godfathered by Father Endeavor Clark. 12mo. (5 x 7½ inches). Pages 212. Price \$1.00 net.

If this story were not vouched for by so well-known and so reliable a "god-father" as Dr. Clark, the founder of the Christian Endeavor Society, it would be hard to accept it as a true story. It reminds us of Harold Begbie's "Twice-born Men." It is in many ways quite as remarkable a tale as any of those which Mr. Begbie has given in his book, and it quite as strikingly illustrates the power of Jesus Christ to save, "even unto the "uttermost" of human guilt and degradation.

The real name of the hero of the story is Thomas F. Anderson. For years he followed the life of a gambler, a tramp, a thief, a dope fiend, a trickster, and a convict. It was while leading this life of dissipation and crime that he was known as "Scotty Kid." Finally he was converted in a rescue mission in Los Angeles. He was literally made a "new creature, born from above." As the author says: "Scotty was a dope fiend, drunkard, thief, trickster, and lazy past telling. Tommy *was born* with diametrically opposite traits. He did not develop them, in the important sense, though they have grown with the using."

The new convert immediately went to work to save others, and in this capacity, as a rescue worker, he soon came to be known as "Brother Tommy." From a mission worker he became a traveling evangelist. Later he drifted to Hawaii where he is engaged in successful mission work among the Spanish, Porto Ricans, and Filipinos who work on the plantations. Such a story is a good bracer to one's faith if it ever is inclined to waver as to whether the gospel of Jesus Christ is still, "the power of God unto salvation."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.





---

---

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

---

---

75 cents per copy

THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLVII—NO. I.

---

**JANUARY, 1917.**

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1917



# CONTENTS

<b>I. The Reformation Quadri-centennial. ....</b>	<b>1</b>
By Professor J. A. Clutz, D.D.	
<b>II. Martin Luther in the Changing Light of Four Centuries. 20</b>	
By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
<b>III. Melanchthon and the Lord's Supper After His Divergence from Luther. ....</b>	<b>52</b>
By Professor John Alfred Faulkner, D.D.	
<b>IV. Caesar and His Soldiers. ....</b>	<b>71</b>
By T. B. Stork.	
<b>V. The Theory of Evolution as Appropriated by Socialism. 85</b>	
By Rev. A. J. Traver.	
<b>VI. Inner Mission—Its Goal.....</b>	<b>99</b>
By Rev. W. H. Feldman.	
<b>VII. Current Theological Thought.....</b>	<b>120</b>
In English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster. D.D.	
In German. By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
<b>VIII. Review of Recent Literature. ....</b>	<b>138</b>
The Formula of Concord—Luther's Christmas Tree—The Challenge of the Sunday School—Life of Adolph Spaeth, D.D., LL.D.—Bible Stories to Read and Tell—The Challenge of the Future—The Mythology of All Races—R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D.—The Man of Power—Modern Messages from Great Hymns—The Undiscovered Country—Foundations of Christian Belief—The Gospel of Good Will as Revealed in Contemporary Scriptures—The Essentials of Religious Education—The Enchanted Universe—The Lord God of Elijah—Usury—Little Journeys with Martin Luther—The Books of the Pentateuch—Year Books—The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1917—Almanac for the Year 1917—Der Zionsbote Christlicher Volkskalendar auf das Jahr 1917—Luther in the Light of Recent Research.	



# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.



BASED ON ORIGINAL SOURCES

# Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters

Translated and Edited by Preserved Smith, Ph. D.

What a wonderful privilege it is to read the private letters of Martin Luther and the active men of Reformation days. These faithful reflections of their innermost lives show their secret feelings, loves, hates, hopes, suspicions, confidences and comments. There is hardly a better way to obtain a clear insight into the causes and effects of the Reformation—it is history at first-hand.

It is also intensely human and with biographical notes and other necessary annotations, sheds much light on this period of Luther's early spiritual struggle, 1507-1521, the time covered by Volume I. Two more volumes are in preparation.

## What Non-Lutherans Have Said About It

"It was a happy thought that suggested the publishing of these letters and the great usefulness of the book is evident and will be appreciated by all those who wish to find the inner sources of the Reformation."—Boston Transcript.

"Such books as this should be in the library of every minister and layman interested in the Reformation period."—Reformed Messenger.

"We doubt if there is another American scholar so well fitted to perform the task as Dr. Smith."—The Advance.

"A treasure-house of the sixteenth century originals more than usually accessible and of great value."—English Historical Review, London.

"This is a valuable source-book of the history of the great revolutionary movement of which Luther was the protagonist."—The Outlook.

Isn't it just the book your library needs—just the information and inspiration you need?

---

**THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY**

1424 ARCH STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

P. A. 2987.5



















